

# Durham E-Theses

---

## *The pragmatic properties and sequential functions of the Japanese sentence-final particles ne, yo and yone*

Saigo, Hideki

### How to cite:

---

Saigo, Hideki (2006) *The pragmatic properties and sequential functions of the Japanese sentence-final particles ne, yo and yone*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/2899/>

### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

---

Academic Support Office, Durham University, University Office, Old Elvet, Durham DH1 3HP  
e-mail: [e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk](mailto:e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk) Tel: +44 0191 334 6107  
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk>

**The Pragmatic Properties and Sequential Functions  
of the Japanese Sentence-Final Particles *Ne*, *Yo* and *Yone***

by

**Hideki Saigo**

**B.A. (Economics) Ritsumeikan, Japan**

**M.A. (Sociolinguistics) Essex, UK**

A copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

**This thesis is submitted for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy**

***Department of Linguistics and Language***

***Faculty of Arts***

***University of Durham***

***UK***

**Supervisor: Peter Grundy**

**External Examiners: Professor Jacob L. Mey and Professor Jenny A. Thomas**

**2006**



**15 MAR 2006**

© Copyright by Hideki Saigo, 2006



## ABSTRACT

Sentence-final particles in Japanese have proved notoriously difficult to explain and are especially challenging for second language users. This thesis examines the role of the Japanese sentence-final particles, *ne*, *yo* and *yone*, in talk-in-interaction with the aim of providing a comprehensive understanding that accounts for their pragmatic properties and sequential functions and that provides a sound basis for second language pedagogy.

Taking as a starting point the failure of existing studies to provide a clear account as to why the particles occur only in interaction, this thesis argues that the pragmatic properties of *ne*, *yo* and *yone* have an important sequential function – that of indicating how the next turn is to relate to the existing turn. Thus the sentence-final particles have a grounding function and provide speakers of Japanese with a means of realizing the figure/ground properties of turns in talk-in-interaction. The function of each particle proposed in this study is shown below:

*Ne* occurs when the speaker proposes that the figure emerging in the talk should be treated as a ground for the next proposition without further ado, typically in the expectation that the figure is either already known to the addressee or readily acceptable (pragmatic property) and thus directs the addressee's acceptance (sequential function).

*Yo* occurs when the speaker intends the figure emerging in the talk to be grounded, typically in the expectation that the figure is either new to the addressee or even controversial (pragmatic property) and thus directs an appropriate response by the addressee (sequential function). We call a response triggered by the force of *yo* an *assumptive* response since, as well as being sequentially appropriate, such a response also provides an inferentially related proposition as the next contribution. This next contribution may also be provided by the original speaker.

In *yone* constructions, *yo* falls within the scope of *ne* so that the speaker proposes that the figure emerging in the talk satisfies the criterion for having *yo* attached to it (pragmatic property) and thus directs the addressee's acceptance of this property (sequential function). In the appropriate context, as well as responding obligatorily to the force of *ne*, a good conversationalist may also respond to the force of *yo*.

The study also considers cases where no particle occurs, and proposes the function of the non-use of any particle (i.e. *zero*) as follows:

*Zero* occurs when the speaker gives no intention as to how the figure emerging in the talk is grounded (pragmatic property) and thus directs the addressee to regard *zero* marked contributions as potentially topic closing (sequential function).

Although the motivation of the present research is pedagogical, the investigator expects this thesis to make a contribution to the rationalistic/empirical debate in pragmatics (Kopytko 1995, 2001 and 2004). The present research clearly illustrates the importance of understanding instances of talk in their sequential context rather than focusing on individual utterances. The study sets out rationalistically in the sense that decontextualized examples are used to set up a Particle Function Hypothesis, and then moves to an empirical stage where naturally occurring talk data are used to test the validity of the hypothesis. The approach followed in this investigation could thus be viewed as an attempt to bring together rationalistic and empirical pragmatic methods.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Abstract</b>	iii
<b>Abbreviations and Symbols in Transcriptions</b>	x
<b>Acknowledgments</b>	xi

## **Chapter One: INTRODUCTION**

1.1 Forward	1
1.2 What is to be examined in the present study	1
1.3 Why the sentence-final particles are chosen for investigation	3
1.4 How the sentence-final particles are described in TJFL materials	3
1.4.1 <i>Ne</i>	4
1.4.2 <i>Yo</i>	6
1.5 What the present study aims to achieve	8
1.6 The significance of the present study	8
1.7 The structure of the present study	9

## **Chapter Two: SENTENCE-FINAL INTERACTIONAL PARTICLES IN JAPANESE: A RECONSIDERATION**

2.1 Introduction	11
2.2 Literature review	12
2.2.1 Studies based on the notion of information	12
2.2.1.1 The information agreement hypothesis	13
2.2.1.2 The territorial information hypothesis	14
2.2.1.3 The discourse processing hypothesis	16
2.2.2 Studies focusing on the communicative functions of the particles	18
2.3 A particle function hypothesis	20
2.3.1 Properties and Functions of <i>ne</i> and <i>yo</i>	20
2.3.1.1 The pragmatic properties of <i>ne</i> and <i>yo</i>	20
2.3.1.2 The sequential functions of <i>ne</i> and <i>yo</i>	25
2.3.2 Properties and functions of <i>yone</i> and <i>zero</i>	27

2.3.3	The PFH under examination	31
2.3.3.1	The use of <i>zero</i>	31
2.3.3.1.1	Assertion + <i>zero</i>	31
2.3.3.1.2	Request + <i>zero</i>	33
2.3.3.1.3	Question + <i>zero</i>	34
2.3.3.2	The use of <i>ne</i>	35
2.3.3.2.1	Assertion + <i>ne</i>	35
2.3.3.2.2	Request + <i>ne</i>	40
2.3.3.2.3	Question + <i>ne</i>	42
2.3.3.3	The use of <i>yo</i>	44
2.3.3.3.1	Assertion + <i>yo</i>	44
2.3.3.3.2	Request + <i>yo</i>	49
2.3.3.3.3	Question + <i>yo</i>	52
2.3.3.4	The use of <i>yone</i>	54
2.3.3.4.1	Assertion + <i>yone</i>	54
2.3.3.4.2	Request + <i>yone</i>	58
2.3.3.4.3	Question + <i>yone</i>	60
2.3.3.5	<i>Ne</i> occurring utterance-internally and independently	60
2.4	Comparison of the use of particles	63
2.4.1	The use of the particles with assertions	63
2.4.2	The use of the particles with requests	64
2.4.3	The use of the particles with questions	66
2.5	Summary	67

### **Chapter Three: METHODOLOGY**

3.1	Introduction	70
3.2	Rationalistic and empirical pragmatics	71
3.3	Choosing a methodology	72
3.4	Data collection	74
3.4.1	Selecting talk types	74
3.4.2	Collecting data	76
3.4.2.1	Ethical consideration	77
3.4.2.2	Recording techniques	78
3.4.2.3	NS-NS everyday talk-in-interaction	79
3.4.2.4	NS-NS goal-oriented talk-in-interaction	79

3.4.2.5 NS-NNS everyday talk-in-interaction	80
3.5 Data analysis	81
3.5.1 Intentionality and inference	82
3.5.2 Conversation analysis	83
3.5.3 Data analysis procedures	85
3.5.3.1 Transcription	86
3.5.3.2 Representation of data in English	86
3.5.4 Segmental vs. holistic analysis	90
3.6 Summary	90

## **Chapter Four: THE PARTICLES IN AN UNMARKED TALK-IN-INTERACTION TYPE**

4.1 Introduction	93
4.2 The particles in everyday types talk	94
4.2.1 Data	94
4.2.2 Analysis	95
4.2.2.1 Extract 1 - Particles occurring utterance-finally (1)	95
4.2.2.2 Extract 2 - Particles occurring utterance-finally (2)	101
4.2.2.3 Extract 3 - Particles occurring utterance-finally (3)	107
4.2.2.4 Extract 4 - Particles attached to nominalized structures	115
4.2.2.5 Extract 5 - Utterance-internal and utterance-independent <i>ne</i>	123
4.3 Summary	128

## **Chapter Five: THE PARTICLES IN A MARKED TALK-IN-INTERACTION TYPE**

5.1 Introduction	130
5.2 The particles in a marked talk type	131
5.2.1 Data	131
5.2.2 Analysis	132
5.2.2.1 Extract 1 - Tactical but unmarked occurrences of particles and responses (1)	133
5.2.2.2 Extract 2 - Tactical and marked occurrences of particles and responses (1)	138
5.2.2.3 Extract 3 - Tactical and marked occurrences of particles and responses (2)	146

5.2.2.4	Extract 4 - Tactical and marked occurrences of particles and responses (3)	153
5.2.2.5	Extract 5 - Tactical but unmarked occurrences of particles and responses (2)	161
5.3	Summary	169

## Chapter Six: THE PARTICLES IN NATIVE/NON-NATIVE TALK-IN-INTERACTION

6.1	Introduction	172
6.2	Native and non-native talk-in-interaction	173
6.2.1	Data	175
6.2.2	Analysis	175
6.2.2.1	Uses of particles	177
6.2.2.1.1	Extract 1 - Expectable use of utterance-final <i>ne</i>	177
6.2.2.1.2	Extract 2 - Expectable use of utterance-internal <i>ne</i>	182
6.2.2.1.3	Extract 3 - Expectable use of <i>ne</i> attached to a nominalised structure	184
6.2.2.1.4	Extract 4 - Failure to use <i>ne</i> (1)	191
6.2.2.1.5	Extract 5 - Failure to use <i>ne</i> (2)	194
6.2.2.1.6	Extract 6 - Failure to use <i>yo</i> (1)	197
6.2.2.1.7	Extract 7 - Failure to use <i>yo</i> (2)	201
6.2.2.1.8	Extract 8 - Failure to use <i>yo</i> (3)	204
6.2.2.1.9	Extract 9 - Expectable use of <i>yone</i>	208
6.2.2.1.10	Extract 10 - Failure to use <i>yone</i>	213
6.2.2.1.11	Extract 11 - Failure to use <i>ne</i> , <i>yo</i> or <i>yone</i>	218
6.2.2.2	Responses to particles	226
6.2.2.2.1	Extract 12 - Expectable responses to utterance-final <i>ne</i>	226
6.2.2.2.2	Extract 13 - Expectable responses to utterance-internal <i>ne</i> and <i>ne</i> attached to a nominalized structure	229
6.2.2.2.3	Extract 14 - Failure to respond to utterance-internal <i>ne</i>	233
6.2.2.2.4	Extract 15 - Failure to respond to utterance-final <i>ne</i>	237
6.2.2.2.5	Extract 16 - An expectable response to a <i>yo</i> -utterance	242
6.2.2.2.6	Extract 17 - Failure to respond to a <i>yo</i> -utterance (1)	244
6.2.2.2.7	Extract 18 - Failure to respond to a <i>yo</i> -utterance (2)	247
6.2.2.2.8	Extract 19 - Failure to respond to a <i>yo</i> -utterance (3)	249

6.3	Summary	252
-----	---------	-----

## **Chapter Seven: CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS**

7.1	Introduction	257
7.2	The extent to which the present study achieved its original research purposes	257
7.3	How the present research is distinctive from earlier studies	259
7.3.1	The sequential function of the particles	259
7.3.2	Extended talk-in-interaction	259
7.3.3	Naturally occurring talk-in-interaction	260
7.3.4	NNS talk	260
7.4	The findings of the present study in relation to broader issues	261
7.4.1	Implications for pragmatics	261
7.4.2	Implications for our understanding of talk-in-interaction	262
7.4.3	Implications for research methodology	264
7.4.4	Implications for TJFL	265
<b>Appendix A</b>	Transcription of an unmarked talk-in-interaction type analysed in Chapter 4	268
<b>Appendix B</b>	Transcription of a marked talk-in-interaction type analysed in Chapter 5	286
<b>Appendix C</b>	Transcription of native/non-native talk-in-interaction analysed in Chapter 6	310
	<b>Bibliography</b>	324

## ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS USED IN TRANSCRIPTIONS

Comp	complementizer
Cop	various forms of copula
Int	intensifier
IP	interactional particle other than the particles ( <i>ne, na, yo</i> and <i>yone</i> ) examined in the present study
LK	linking nominal
Neg	negation
Nom	nominalizer
O	object marker
Q	question marker
QT	quotation marker
S	subject marker
Tag	tag-like expression
Top	topic marker

CAPITALS	words in capitals mark a section of speech noticeably louder than that surrounding it.
.	a stop indicates a falling intonation.
,	a comma indicates a 'continuing' intonation.
?	a question mark indicates a rising intonation.
!	an exclamation mark is used to indicate an animated or emphatic tone.
:	a colon indicates a lengthened vowel.
(. )	a stop enclosed in a bracket indicates a pause in the talk of less than two-tenths of a second.
(0.5)	a number in brackets indicates a time in tenths of a second.
[ ]	square brackets between adjacent lines of concurrent speech indicate the onset and end of a spate of overlapping talk.
=	the 'equals' sign indicates 'latching' between utterances.
–	a dash indicates the cut-off of the prior word or sound as the speaker self-edits.
.hh	a stop before 'hh' indicates speaker in-breath.
hh	'hh' indicates an out-breath.
( )	empty parentheses indicate the presence of an unclear fragment on the tape.
∅	the slashed <i>zero</i> symbol indicates the absence of a sentence-final particle.



## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to offer my sincerest and deepest appreciation to my supervisor, Peter Grundy. For the past several years, his dedication, patience, and tireless support have not only greatly contributed to my dissertation, but also to my development as a professional and as a person. I hope that I can emulate his remarkable example as I progress through my career and life.

I am also indebted to many other individuals for direct and indirect help with the writing of this thesis.

Finally, I am grateful for Durham, one of the most beautiful cities in Europe. Living in such a fascinating city never failed to provide me with the vigor to complete this work.

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Forward

Starting the present study, this introductory chapter sets out to answer the following six questions:

- (1) What is to be examined in the present study?
- (2) Why are the sentence-final particles chosen for investigation?
- (3) How are the sentence-final particles described in Teaching Japanese as a Foreign Language (TJFL) materials?
- (4) What does the present study aim to achieve?
- (5) How is the present study significant?
- (6) How is the present study structured?

### 1.2 What is to be examined in the present study

The present study examines the use of the Japanese particles *ne*, *yo* and *yone*. Following the famous Japanese proverb 百聞は一見にしかず *hyakubun wa ikken ni shikazu* (to see just once is worth a hundred descriptions), first of all, let us observe the possible use of Japanese sentence-final particles in the following invented exchange between two classmates:



(1a)

- 1 David: How did you date?  
2 Mark: I had a good time.  
3 David: That's good.  
4 Mark: Yeah.  
5 David: Who did you go out with, then?  
6 Mark: We:ll.  
7 David: Who?  
8 Mark: Anne.  
9 David: You fancy a girl like Anne, don't you?  
10 Mark: Yeah. I don't like chatty girls.  
11 David: I see. By the way, she's just changed her mobile, hasn't she?  
12 Mark: Yeah. She told me her number last night.  
13 David: Oh, please tell me.  
14 Mark: I can't. Ask her directly.

In the following version of David and Mark's conversation, the investigator tries to use *ne* and *yo* in the most expectable ways.

(1b)

- 1 David: How did you date?  
2 Mark: I had a good time *yo*.  
3 David: That's good *ne*.  
4 Mark: Yeah.  
5 David: Who did you go out with, then?  
6 Mark: We:ll.  
7 David: Who *yo*.  
8 Mark: Anne.  
9 David: You fancy a girl like Anne *ne*.  
10 Mark: Yeah. I don't like chatty girls.  
11 David: I see. By the way, she's just changed her mobile *yone*.  
12 Mark: Yeah. She told me her number last night.  
13 David: Oh, please tell me *yo*.  
14 Mark: I can't *yo*. Ask her directly.

As can be seen in (1b), as well as the *zero* option, there are three positive option possibilities: utterances that end with *ne*, utterances that end with *yo*, and utterances that end with *yone*. These, then, are the phenomena to be examined in the present study.

### **1.3 Why the sentence-final<sup>1</sup> particles are chosen for investigation**

There are four reasons why these particles are examined in the present study. Firstly, the occurrence of the particles in conversation is very frequent, so much so that it is difficult or impossible to hold a conversation without them. Secondly, although a number of scholars have researched the particles, no comprehensive account of the functions of the particles has yet been provided (Shibatani, 1990: 360). Thirdly, they are one of the basic grammatical categories that TJFL (Teaching Japanese as a Foreign Language) instructors have difficulties in explaining, and that those learning Japanese often use inappropriately or unacceptably. Fourthly, the unexpected use of the particles may well be considered as a reflection of a speaker's odd personality rather than just as a grammatical mistake (Uyeno, 1971: 62). The misuse of sentence-final particles is thus as much sociopragmatic as pragmalinguistic (Leech, 1983; Thomas, 1983). For all, these reasons, the investigator, himself a teacher of TJFL, is strongly motivated to investigate this troublesome category.

### **1.4 How the sentence-final particles are described in TJFL materials**

Focusing on the third reason mentioned above, this section considers how the

---

<sup>1</sup> Although this thesis will show that the topic of investigation would be more accurately described as utterance-final particles, here and elsewhere I follow the convention of referring to them as sentence-final particles.

particles are described in the TJFL pedagogic literature. Some shortcomings in the descriptions are also discussed.

#### 1.4.1 *Ne*

*Ne* is described in major TJFL textbooks in the following ways:

*Ne* (is used for) for soliciting the listener's agreement or confirmation.

- *Situational Functional Japanese Vol. 1: Notes* - (Introduction p.19)

The particle *ne* comes at the end of sentence or phrase and, like 'you see' or 'isn't there/it?' in English, seeks the confirmation and agreement of the other person.

The particle *yo* tells, while the particle *ne* asks.

- *Japanese For Busy people 1* - (p.58)

*Ne*: a confirmation-seeker; with rising intonation seeks confirmation of an assumption made by the speaker: 'right?', 'don't you agree?', 'isn't it?', etc.

- *Japanese: The Spoken Language Part 1* - (p.33)

*Ne* is used at the end of a sentence. Usually it is used...to either solicit agreement from the hearer or to make sure that he is following the flow of the conversation. It roughly corresponds to English tag questions (isn't it?, aren't you?, etc). It is usually pronounced with a rising pitch.

- *An Introduction to Modern Japanese* - (p.22)

*Ne* is put at the end of a sentence to add feeling or to seek agreement from the listener. (*ne* is not used in a monologue.)

- *Shin Nihongo no Kiso 1: Grammatical Notes in English* - (p.13)

As seen above, as far as *ne* is concerned, there seems to be a consensus that it seeks the addressee's agreement and confirmation, and it is presented as equivalent to English tag questions. The problem with these accounts is that they are extremely brief in comparison

to those provided for other important grammatical categories and do not provide learners with a sufficient explanation.

Consider:

- (2) ii    booshi desu ø.  
     nice hat    Cop  
     *That's a nice hat ø.*

A learner may say (2) without using *ne* when he does not intend to seek the addressee's agreement and merely wishes to compliment her on her hat. However, an addressee would probably feel uncomfortable if such an utterance without *ne* was directed at her. This is because *ne* is more or less obligatory if the speaker is to maintain or establish mutual rapport with the addressee. The *zero* utterance here would indicate that the speaker expects no response, and thus the function of *ne* can be better understood in relation to the function of *zero*.

Consider another example. Having read that *ne* seeks an agreement from the addressee, a learner may think that the following utterance should be marked with *ne*:

- (3) kinoo        honda san    ni aimashita ne.  
     yesterday Honda Title to met        ne  
     *I met Ms Honda yesterday ne.*

However, this is only appropriate if the addressee already knows that the speaker met Ms Honda on the preceding day. But if the addressee does not know that the speaker met Ms Honda on the previous day, she would feel uncomfortable with his use of *ne* here. Learners are liable to be misled because the grammar book descriptions of *ne* only explain its sequential, agreement-seeking function and not its pragmatic property, which requires an appropriate context, as we shall see later.

### 1.4.2 *Yo*

The textbook descriptions of *yo* seem more problematic than those of *ne*. *Yo* is described in a range of major TJFL textbooks in the ways indicated below:

*Yo*: a particle of assertion; common in assurances, contradictions, and warnings (to the addressees); indicates that the speaker assumes s/he is providing the addressee with new information or a new suggestion...

- *Japanese: The Spoken Language Part 1* - (p.33)

Added to the end of the sentence, final particles express the speaker's emotions of doubt, emphasis, caution, hesitation, wonder, admiration and the like....*Yo* (is used) to indicate that the listener is being informed of something.

- *Situational Functional Japanese Vol. 1: Notes* - (p.19)

*Yo* is a particle used at the end of a sentence to emphasize information that the listener does not know or to show one is giving one's judgment or views strongly.

- *Shin Nihongo no Kiso 1: Grammatical Notes in English* - (p.15)

The sentence-final particle *yo* is used by a speaker to indicate strong conviction about a statement or to indicate that he is giving new information to the listener; that is, information that the speaker thinks he or she, but not the listener, knows.

- *Yookoso!: An Invitation to Contemporary Japanese* - (p.110)

The particle *yo* is added to the end of a sentence to call attention to information the speaker thinks the other person does not know.

- *Japanese For Busy people 1* - (p.58)

What we have to consider here is whether or not the above explanations are clear enough for students of the language to understand the function of the particle. Let us consider some examples which demonstrate the problems inherent in the above explanations.

As seen above, it is often said in TJFL textbooks that when the speaker is providing information new to the addressee, he will attach *yo* to the utterance. A student

who has read this explanation might well say:

- (4) deibitto desu yo.  
David Cop yo  
*I am David yo.*

when he introduces himself to Ms Honda. He uses *yo* since he provides her with new information. However, she will probably feel uncomfortable with this use of *yo*.

Another learner of Japanese may say:

- (5) kimi wa mada miseenen da ø.  
you Top still under-age Cop  
*You are still under age ø.*

to a young girl who is drinking beer, intending to encourage the girl to stop drinking. He does not use *yo* since the girl obviously knows that she is under age. However, *yo* is typically used in this context, a text which contradicts the explanation that *yo* is used when the speaker expects the information contained in the utterance to be new to the addressee.

In TJFL material, *yo* is also sometimes defined as a marker used to emphasize the content of an utterance. However, the term ‘emphasize’ is so abstract that it is hardly possible to know what such explanations actually mean. Having read such an explanation, a learner might say to his Japanese teacher:

- (6) haha ga eekoku kara kimasu yo.  
Mother S U.K. from come yo  
*My mother is coming from the U.K. yo.*

intending to emphasize the proposition contained in his utterance since his mother has never been to Japan before. However, a teacher would probably feel uneasy with this use of *yo*, and feel obliged to say something in return, although what he/she is expected to say in return is far from clear.



Furthermore, the explanation that *yo* is often attached to speech acts such as assurances, contradictions and warnings does not tell us why such speech acts often require the particle.

Having examined the textbook descriptions of *ne* and *yo* in TJFL materials, there seems to be scope for the descriptions to be improved. Goddard rightly observes:

Many grammars devote no more than a handful of pages to discourse particles and interjections, and some omit them entirely. Partly this is because conventional description focuses on the sentence and often relies on heavily on examples obtained from elicitation rather than natural conversation. Partly it is because most particles are usually ‘optional’ in the strict grammatical sense, and do not interface with the major systems of grammar. And partly it is because particle and interjection meanings are so difficult to state (Goddard, 1998: 165-166).

## **1.5 What the present study aims to achieve**

The present study has two principal objectives. The first is to propose and test a hypothesis sufficient to account for the use of the sub-set of Japanese sentence-final particles *ne*, *yo* and *yone*. The second is to explain the ‘awkwardness’ native speakers (hereafter NSs ) feel in interacting with non-native speakers (hereafter NNSs ) in relation to particle use.

## **1.6 The significance of the present study**

There are several ways which the present study is distinct from earlier studies of the particles. First of all, the present study proposes an account of the functions of *ne* and

*yo* which explains why they occur only in interaction. Secondly, based on the proposed functions of sentence-final *ne* and *yo*, it also uniquely accounts for the function of *yone*, and of *ne* not only when it occurs sentence-finally but also when it occurs both utterance-internally and independently. Thirdly, it explains the function of the non-use of any particle in talk-in-interaction (i.e. sentence-final *zero*), a phenomenon that needs to be accounted for in any consideration of the function of the particles. Fourthly, the present research takes into account the *sequentiality* of talk-in-interaction: how particle use is related to the trajectory of conversation is closely examined using a qualitative research method. Fifthly, a range of *empirical*, i.e. naturally-occurring, talk data, is closely examined so as to test the validity of the hypothesis which is set up on the basis of rationalistic data, or invented examples. Lastly, as far as the investigator knows, the present study is the only investigation which involves the empirical examination of the ways a NNS uses the particles and responds to utterances in which the particles occur in extended talk.

## 1.7 The structure of the present study

This section briefly describes how the remainder of the thesis is structured.

**Chapter Two**, i.e. the next chapter, reviews the existing literature on the particles. In the literature review, we point out some of the shortcomings of former studies, particularly claiming that they fail to provide a persuasive account of the reason why the particles only occur in interaction. Secondly, it proposes an original hypothesis to account for the functions of the particles from a rationalistic or predictive perspective, so as to remedy the shortcomings of the former studies and provide a better understanding of the particles.

**Chapter Three** explains how the rationalistic hypothesis is tested empirically: it describes the methodology employed for data collection, including choice of informants, choice of data, data collection procedures, and methods of data analysis, including techniques for representing Japanese talk data in English, for transcribing data and for analyzing it.

**Chapter Four** presents a close analysis of the use of particles in an instance of ‘small talk’ involving two female native Japanese speakers.

In contrast to the analysis of the use of particles in what might be termed an unmarked talk-in-interaction type in Chapter Four, **Chapter Five** continues to demonstrate the validity of the hypothesis, this time showing the explanatory adequacy of the hypothesis in a *marked* talk-in-interaction type, i.e. in goal-directed talk-in-interaction. The data drawn on in this chapter consist of a radio phone-in exchange involving a caller and a host, both male.

Having demonstrated the validity of the hypothesis in the two previous chapters, **Chapter Six** examines both expectable and non-expectable uses of particles and responses to them in an instance of ‘everyday’ talk involving a female native speaker and a male non-native speaker so as to seek to explain the ‘awkwardness’ NSs feel in talking to NNSs when the particles are not used and responded to in expectable ways.

**Chapter Seven**, the concluding chapter, summarises the previous chapters, and discusses how the findings of the present study can be related to broader issues in pragmatics, talk-in-interaction theory, research methodology generally and TJFL.

## CHAPTER 2

### SENTENCE-FINAL INTERACTIONAL PARTICLES IN JAPANESE: A RECONSIDERATION

#### 2.1 Introduction

Like many other languages, Japanese also has a variety of particles. Shibatani (1990: 334) classifies particles in four categories:

- (A) *Case particles*, which indicate the semantic or logical relationships of nominal elements with regard to other nominals or predicative elements
- (B) *Conjunctive particles*, which conjoin sentences
- (C) *Interjunctive particles*, which occur freely within a clause and whose presence or absence does not affect sentence formation
- (D) *Final particles*, which occur in sentence-final position.

As mentioned in Chapter One, the interest of the present study is in the fourth category. Even this individual category contains a number of different sentence-final particles, which are also called ‘interactional particles’ by some scholars (Maynard, 1993: 183). They are so named because they appear only in spoken interaction (face-to-face conversation, telephone conversation, etc.) and written interaction (personal letters and emails, etc.), but not in theses, newspapers, business letters and so on. Among these particles, three, *ne*, *yo*, and *yone*, will be focused on in this study for the reasons

discussed in the previous chapter (p.3).

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section briefly reviews the literature on the function of the particles *ne* and *yo*, and draws attention to some of the problems in the existing studies. In order to solve the problems found in the studies of *ne* and *yo*, the second section will then provide an original hypothesis which takes account of the sequential function of the particles, in the process drawing on the figure/ground *gestalt*. It is hoped that this reconsideration will offer a more comprehensive understanding than that suggested in the existing literature. As to *yone*, its function is not considered until the second section since it has hardly been studied in the earlier investigations.

## **2.2 Literature review**

There are a large number of existing studies of the sentence-final particles that are reviewed in this study, reflecting the wide variety of approaches that have been taken to the particles. However, it seems that there is still no plausible, comprehensive hypothesis capable of accounting for their functions. Given the variety of approaches, it is not easy to group the studies. However, I will attempt to do this by dividing them into two major categories (cf. Eda, 2001: 169):

- (a) Studies based on the notion of information
- (b) Studies focusing on the communicative function of the particles.

### **2.2.1 Studies based on the notion of information**

The studies in this category typically consider the selection of the particles as an

indication of how the speaker relates to the information contained in the utterance. Such studies can be further divided into three sub-categories or, as I shall treat them here, hypotheses, the informational agreement hypothesis, the territorial information hypothesis and the discourse processing hypothesis.

### 2.2.1.1 The information agreement hypothesis

According to this hypothesis, *ne* is used when the speaker and the addressee have the same proprietary status with regard to knowledge of the information being conveyed, whereas *yo* is used when the speaker and the addressee have different proprietary statuses with regard to knowledge of the information being conveyed. This position is associated particularly with the work of Cheng (1987), Masuoka (1991), and Oso (1986). Thus, (1a) below will occur when the speaker thinks that Guinness is tasty and believes that the addressee also thinks that it is tasty, and (1b) will occur when the speaker thinks that it is tasty but does not think that the addressee holds the same opinion.

(1a) ginesu wa oishii ne.  
Guinness Top delicious ne  
*Guinness is tasty ne.*

(1b) ginesu wa oishii yo.  
Guinness Top delicious yo  
*Guinness is tasty yo.*

Imagine a situation where Mr Toyota and Ms Honda are friends. They go to a liquor shop together to buy some drinks and he suggests to her that they should buy Guinness. If Ms Honda likes Guinness, she will probably say (1a), and if she tells him that she does not like it, he may say (1b).

However, it is not difficult to find examples which cannot be explained with this hypothesis. Suppose that Mr Toyota and Ms Honda are indoors looking out of the window, and he says ‘It’s raining again.’ In this situation, he can mark his utterance with either *ne* or *yo*. Although the use of *ne* can be explained with the information agreement hypothesis, the use of *yo* cannot since Ms Honda obviously sees the rain and therefore has the same knowledge as Mr Toyota.

### 2.2.1.2 The territorial information hypothesis

According to the territorial information hypothesis, *ne* is used when the preceding information is in the territory of the addressee, while *yo* is used when it is in the territory of the speaker (Kamio, 1990, 1994). For example, when the speaker believes that the information about the traditional Scottish dish called haggis is in the addressee’s territory and not in his<sup>1</sup> territory, he will use *ne* as seen in (2a):

- (2a) hagisu wa oishii ne.  
 haggis Top delicious ne  
*Haggis is tasty ne.*

When the speaker believes that such information is in his territory and not in the addressee’s, he will use *yo*, as seen in (2b):

- (2b) hagisu wa oishii yo.  
 haggis Top delicious yo  
*Haggis is tasty yo.*

---

<sup>1</sup> In this research, male designating pronouns and possessive determiners such as ‘he’, ‘his’, ‘him’ and ‘himself’ are used for speakers, and female designating forms such as ‘she’, ‘her’, and ‘herself’ for addressees. This decision is motivated purely for the sake of convenience and follows the convention adopted in Blakemore, 1992.

Suppose that an English man and a Scottish woman go to a restaurant which serves a range of Scottish dishes. When they are eating the haggis they have ordered, the man may say (2a) to the woman and, responding to his comment, she may say (2b) to him.

The hypothesis becomes more elaborate if territory of information is considered to be a continuum rather than dichotomous, i.e. relative rather than absolute (Cheng, 1987; Kamio, 1990, 1994; Maynard, 1993). Supposing that a speaker and an addressee are friends of Peter, and that both are equally close to him. When the speaker feels that he has either less or the same degree of access as the addressee to the news about Peter's vacation, he will use *ne*, as in (3a).

- (3a) piitaa raishuu supein ni iku ne.  
 Peter next-week Spain to go ne  
*Peter is going to Spain next week ne.*

The feeling that he has more access than the addressee to the news will prompt him to use *yo*, as in (3b).

- (3b) piitaa raishuu supein ni iku yo.  
 Peter next-week Spain to go yo  
*Peter is going to Spain next week yo.*

However, the problem with this hypothesis is that the notion of territory becomes very difficult to grasp in some cases. Suppose that when Mr Toyota and Ms Honda are talking about their annual incomes, he asks her how much tax she paid last year. Having considered the question for a little while, she says:

- (4) hyakuman en gurai desu ne.  
 one-million yen about Cop ne  
*About one-million yen ne.*



*Ne* is one of the choices she might make in this situation. If the territorial information hypothesis is correct, therefore, some information should be in Mr Toyota's territory in this case. However, it is clear that in most cases the information about Ms Honda's tax falls into her territory and not his. Examples like (4) may suggest that the territorial information hypothesis is not always useful in explaining the functions of the particles.

So far we have examined two hypotheses, both based on the notion that the selection of particles depends on how the speaker sees the attribution of information contained in the utterance between himself and the addressee. The third hypothesis is based on the related idea that the selection of particles depends on the degree to which the speaker accepts the information he conveys.

### **2.2.1.3 The discourse processing hypothesis**

Katagiri (1995: 40) points out that a dialogue which is a joint activity involving more than one person is different from a monologue in that its participants are required to respond to the dynamic development of a dialogue instantly and need to grasp how other participants accept information in order to advance the conversation efficiently. Taking this view, he argues that the particles *ne* and *yo* co-ordinate the course of an interaction, indicating the degree of speaker acceptance of the information being conveyed. He treats *ne* as a linguistic marker which indicates that the particular information being conveyed has not yet been fully accepted by the speaker. *Yo*, on the other hand, is regarded as a marker that indicates the speaker's full acceptance of the particular information that he is trying to convey.<sup>2</sup> Consider the following minimal pair:

---

<sup>2</sup> See Takubo and Kinsui (1997) and Kinsui and Takubo (1998) for similar discussions.

- (5a) Toyota san no tanjoobi wa shichigatsu yokka da ne.  
 Toyota Title LK birthday Top July 4th Cop ne  
*Mr Toyota's birthday is on 4 July ne.*
- (5b) Toyota san no tanjoobi wa shichigatsu yokka da yo.  
 Toyota Title LK birthday Top July 4th Cop yo  
*Mr Toyota's birthday is on 4 July yo.*

Following this hypothesis, *ne* in (5a) indicates that the speaker has not fully accepted the information about Mr Toyota's birthday, i.e. he is not entirely sure of the date. *Yo* in (5b) indicates that the speaker has fully accepted the information, i.e. he is certain of it. Suppose that somebody asks you when Mr Toyota's birthday is. If you are not entirely sure of the date, you will say (5a), encoding your uncertainty in the answer, whereas if you are confident in your knowledge, you will say (5b).

However, as Kato (2001: 35) points out, the notion of acceptance is very ambiguous. Suppose that a boy is going to the post office. When he leaves the house, he tells his mother:

- (6) yuubinkyoku ni ittekuru ne.  
 post-office to go-and-return ne  
*I'm going to the post office ne.*

According to Katagiri's explanation, the utterance should be marked by *yo* and not *ne* because it is bizarre to imagine that the boy is not fully confident in what he conveys under such circumstances. However, this utterance would be marked by *ne* just as frequently as by *yo*.

We have examined three hypotheses which seek to explain the function of the particles *ne* and *yo*, and which are all based on the notion of information. The first hypothesis relates the speaker and addressee in terms of their differing degrees of knowledge of the information presented in the exchange, the second relates the speaker

and the addressee in terms of whose territory the information falls within, and the third considers the relationship between the speaker and his knowledge of the information being conveyed. In our discussion, we have also pointed out the shortcomings of each of these hypotheses.

### **2.2.2 Studies focusing on the communicative functions of the particles**

In addition to the studies based on the notion of information, there are also a number of studies which focus more on the communicative function of the particles. Kato (2001) considers that a speaker uses the particles in strategic ways to show how he intends to organise the conversation, rather than to align himself with the information contained in the utterance. Kato treats *yo* as a discourse marker which indicates that the speaker intends to treat the proposition contained in the utterance as exclusive to himself. Therefore, adding *yo* to the proposition indicates the speaker's belief that the credibility of the proposition is beyond dispute and that he is willing to take responsibility for it. He treats *ne*, on the other hand, as a marker that indicates that the speaker does not intend to treat the proposition contained in the utterance as exclusive to himself. That is to say, the use of *ne* indicates that the speaker intends to leave some room for the addressee to have access to the proposition and thus to confirm or modify it.

Although the terms used in her paper are different, Yoshimi's (1997) argument is similar to Kato's: disagreeing with the common perspective that the particles show the speaker's epistemic stance towards the information contained in the utterance, Yoshimi argues that the particles index the speaker's affective position. She argues that *ne* indexes the speaker's shared affective stance with the addressee whereas *yo* indexes the

speaker's non-shared affective stance with the addressee. Similar ideas on the function of *ne* can be also seen in Kamio (1990), Izuhara (1992) and Cook (1990, 1992). Kamio (1990) states that *ne* is a marker used by the speaker to show his 'co-operative attitude' to the addressee and invites the addressee to share the same cognitive state as his own. Izuhara (1992) treats *ne* as a marker which urges the addressee to share the speaker's feeling or position. Cook (1990, 1992) argues that '*ne* directly indexes affective common ground and indirectly indexes various conversational functions that require the addressee's cooperation' (1992: 507).

The studies focusing on the communicative functions of the particles are significantly different from the studies based on the notion of information in that, while the latter treat particles as markers obligatorily chosen to reflect the speaker's proprietary interest in the information contained in the utterance, the former treat them as strategic devices used to achieve communicative goals. However, most notions used in the information paradigm are very difficult to grasp and, more importantly, they do not provide clear explanations as to why the speaker uses the particles in interaction. In the next section, therefore, we will propose an original hypothesis which accounts for the association between the use of particles and interaction, in the process introducing the role of the figure/ground *gestalt* in sequentiality into our discussion. In considering the relevance of these two notions, this hypothesis will therefore account for both the pragmatic and the sequential functions of the particles.

## 2.3 A Particle Function Hypothesis

In the particle function hypothesis that will be proposed in this section of the chapter (hereafter PFH), the particles are considered to have both pragmatic properties and sequential functions.

### 2.3.1 Properties and functions of *ne* and *yo*

First of all, the functions of *ne* and *yo* will be examined.

#### 2.3.1.1 The pragmatic properties of *ne* and *yo*

We hypothesize that the pragmatic properties of the particles are profoundly related to the figure/ground hypothesis, which originated in *gestalt* psychology. Suppose that you are now looking out of the window of your house. In doing this, what you see is not the real image of the world in a strict sense. You unconsciously choose to see some parts of what is the other side of the window as more salient than other parts. For example, you may focus on the hospital two kilometres away from your present location rather than on its surroundings. In *gestalt* psychology, something visually salient (i.e. the hospital) is called the *figure*, whereas what is unaccented (i.e. the surroundings of the hospital) is called the *ground* (Rubin, 1915).

The figure/ground *gestalt* later became one of the most fundamental informing notions in cognitive linguistics<sup>3</sup>, where it is appealed to at a number of linguistic levels (Hanks and Duranti, 1992; Langacker, 1987, 1990; Talmy, 1978, 1988; Wallace, 1982,

---

<sup>3</sup> The figure/ground *gestalt* also underlies the crucial distinctions between profile and base and between trajectory and landmark on which Langacker's *Foundations of Cognitive Linguistics* depends. See Langacker 1987: 120-122 for further discussion.

etc.). This is because it is believed that this notion is associated not only with visual perception but also with language understanding as one of the informing notions of ‘embodiment’, the linguistic conceptualization of our experience of the world in language. Consider:

(7) When I fly, I try to avoid British Airways.

When we hear the above utterance, our focus is generally on the main clause ‘I try to avoid British Airways’ rather than on the subordinate clause ‘When I fly’. That is, we treat the main clause as the figure of the utterance and the subordinate clause as the ground. The figure is something the speaker intends to assert, while the ground is what the speaker intends to presuppose or assume and to be accepted as presupposed or assumed by the addressee. For that reason, a response in the form of the question ‘Why?’ will be taken to apply to the asserted figure rather than to the presupposed ground.

Although the notion of the figure/ground *gestalt* has been hardly applied to discourse level or talk-in-interaction yet<sup>4</sup>, there is no reason why we cannot think that the figure/ground *gestalt* also applies at this level: indeed it is difficult to imagine how talk-in-interaction could proceed unless language was to be able to encode in some way whether the various ideas emerging in the talk should be treated as figure or ground in the ongoing exchange with the addressee.

The present study argues that the figure/ground *gestalt* works in talk-in-interaction in the following way: each distinct utterance in a turn constitutional unit and the turn constitutional unit itself is a figure when it is presented by the speaker to the

---

<sup>4</sup> See Grundy and Jiang (2001) and Grundy (2002) for the application of the figure/ground *gestalt* to an extended talk-in-interaction.

addressee, in the sense that it is foregrounded in relation to the conversational background. Subsequently, the figure is grounded, by either the speaker or the addressee in one of a limited number of ways. That is to say, each figure becomes the ground for the next utterance which replaces it as figure. Furthermore, the researcher regards the Japanese sentence-final particles *ne* and *yo* as the typical linguistic markers which signal how the figure emerging in the talk either is or should be grounded.

Specifically, *ne* occurs when the speaker proposes that the figure emerging in the talk should be treated as a ground for the next proposition without further ado. Thus, it typically occurs when he expects that the figure is either already known to the addressee or readily acceptable. For the sake of simplicity, at this stage the researcher will treat this as equivalent to the speaker grounding the figure himself, although later we will return to this point and justify the claim that *ne* utterances are actually invitations to treat as ground.

*Yo* occurs when the speaker intends an addressee to ground the emerging figure in the talk. Because of this, it typically occurs when the speaker expects that the figure is either new to the addressee or even controversial. Suppose that Mr Toyota intends to convey to Ms Honda that the weather is bad today. When he proposes that the figure emerging in the talk should be treated as a ground without further ado, he will mark the utterance with *ne*, as in (8a). When he intends the addressee to ground the figure emerging in the talk, treating it as controversial or as a new proposition to her, he will mark the utterance with *yo*, as in (8b).

- (8a) kyoo tenki warui ne.  
today weather bad ne  
*It is bad weather today ne.*

- (8b) kyoo tenki warui yo.  
 today weather bad yo  
*It is bad weather today yo.*

These explanations of the functions of the particles take into account their pragmatic properties in the sense that the particles are considered as instructing the addressee to interpret the proposition contained in the preceding utterances in particular ways. In this sense, the particles can be considered as a kind of *procedural encoding* (Blakemore, 1987), although they are required even when the pragmatic intention of an utterance is readily inferable without them, whereas procedural encodings, at least in Blakemore's sense, are typically used when the required inference is not readily drawn without them.

The above pragmatic account seems capable of integrating the three hypotheses examined in the studies based on the notion of information. Let us re-examine the examples discussed before. All uses of *ne* in examples (1a), (2a), (3a), (4), (5a) and (6) can be accounted for with the explanation of *ne* proposed here: marking the utterance with *ne*, the speaker proposes that the figure emerging in the talk should be regarded as a ground for the next proposition without further ado in the expectation that the addressee will not find it controversial:

- (1a) Guinness is tasty *ne*.

[Given Mr Toyota's earlier suggestion that they should buy Guinness, it is highly likely that he will share Ms Honda's comment that it is tasty (and thus be willing to treat her comment as a ground for the next proposition).]

- (2a) Haggis is tasty *ne*.

[Given that the addressee is Scottish, it is highly likely that she will share this Englishman's view (and thus be willing to treat it as a ground for the next proposition).]

- (3a) Peter is going to Spain next week *ne*.

[Given that the addressee is at least as likely as the speaker to know about Peter's plan in the context cited for this utterance on p.15, it is highly likely that she will share his view (and thus be willing to treat it as a ground for the next proposition).]



- (4) It's about one-million yen ne.  
[Given that this is an answer to a question asked by the Mr Toyota, Mr Toyota is expected to be willing to accept the information conveyed (and thus be willing to treat it as a ground for the next proposition).]
- (5a) Mr Toyota's birthday is on 4 July ne.  
[Given that the speaker is asking about a date of which he is less than 100% certain, the addressee is invited to confirm the speaker's proposition (and thus be willing to treat it as a ground for the next proposition).]
- (6) I'm going to the post office ne.  
[Given that the speaker seeks the addressee's acceptance of his proposed action and that he would be unlikely to propose an action unless such an acceptance was expectable, it is highly likely that she will be willing to accept this proposal (and thus be willing to treat it as a ground for the next proposition).]

Likewise, all the uses of *yo* in examples (1b), (2b), (3b), and (5b) can be accounted for with the proposed explanation of *yo*: marking the utterance with *yo*, the speaker intends the addressee to ground the figure emerging in the talk in the expectation that it may be new to the addressee or even controversial:

- (1b) Guinness is tasty yo.  
[It is highly expectable from Ms Honda's previous utterance that she will find his opinion on the beer to be contentious (so that she is required to ground Mr Toyota's view with a rejoinder of some kind).]
- (2b) Haggis is tasty yo.  
[The Englishman thus addressed is unlikely to know about haggis (and is therefore required to ground the (Scottish) speaker's opinion with a rejoinder of some kind).]
- (3b) Peter is going to Spain next week yo.  
[The speaker expects that the information may well be new to the addressee (and invites her to ground this new information with an appropriate rejoinder).]
- (5b) Mr Toyota's birthday is 4 July yo.  
[The speaker expects that the information may be new to the addressee (and invites her to ground this new information with an appropriate rejoinder).]

### 2.3.1.2 The sequential functions of *ne* and *yo*

On its own, the pragmatic explanation proposed above fails to provide a clear account of the reason *why* the particles occur only in interaction, in other words, why signals as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded are a particular property of talk-in-interaction. In order to solve this problem, we argue that the particles derive sequential functions from their pragmatic properties: through the use of particles, the speaker explicitly indicates his intention as to how the utterance should be responded to in what is sequentially adjacent. Taking the sequential nature of the particles into account, their functions can now be more clearly explained.

*Ne* occurs when the speaker proposes that the figure emerging in the talk should be treated as a ground for the next proposition without further ado in the expectation that the figure emerging in the talk is either already known to the addressee or is readily acceptable (pragmatic property) and thus directs the addressee's acceptance of it (sequential function). These sequential functions are indicated in parentheses for examples (1a), (2a), (3a), (4), (5a), and (6) on pp.23-24. Therefore, in example (9), Mr Toyota marks the utterance with *ne* when he proposes that the figure that it is a nice day today should be treated as a ground for the next proposition without further ado and thus directs Ms Honda's acceptance in the next turn, as in (9):

- (9) Mr Toyota: kyoo tenki ii ne.  
                  today weather good ne  
                  *It's a nice day ne.*
- Ms Honda: ee.  
                  yes  
                  *Yes.*

*Yo* occurs when the speaker intends the figure emerging in the talk to be grounded in the expectation that the figure emerging in the talk may be new to the

addressee or even controversial (pragmatic property) and thus directs an appropriate response by the addressee (sequential property). Again, these sequential functions are indicated in parentheses for example (1b), (2b), (3b) and (5b) on p.24. Therefore, Mr Toyota marks the utterance with *yo* when he intends Ms Honda to ground the figure that it is a nice day today and thus directs an appropriate response, as in (10):

(10) Mr Toyota: kyoo tenki ii yo.  
 today weather good yo  
*It's a nice day today yo.*

Ms Honda: dokka iku?  
 somewhere go  
*Shall we go somewhere?*

What is important here, however, is that it is possible for Mr Toyota to continue talking after his own *yo*-utterance, so as to produce his own response, as in (11):

(11) Mr Toyota: kyoo tenki ii yo. dokka iku?  
 today weather good yo somewhere go  
*It's a nice day today yo. Shall we go somewhere?*

That is to say, he can choose either the addressee or himself as next turn taker.

As seen in (10) and (11), an appropriate response to a *yo*-utterance both grounds the *yo*-utterance and provides a very distinct kind of response. We may call a response triggered by the force of *yo* an *assumptive response* since the responses can be assumed as sequentially appropriate whilst at the same time contributing an inferentially related proposition as the next contribution.

The above pragmatic and sequential accounts of the functions of *ne* and *yo* explain why the particles occur only in interaction. In addition, they do this in a more explicit way than existing proposals.

### 2.3.2 Properties and functions of *yone* and *zero*

Having proposed this original account of *ne* and *yo*, we now turn to the sentence-final particle *yone*, which also occurs frequently in talk-in-interaction. There can be two ways of explaining *yone*: one way is to consider it as a single independent particle, and the other is to treat it as a combination of *yo* and *ne*, i.e. the form *ne* is attached to *yo*. Consider:

- (12) kyoo wa atsui yone.  
today Top hot yone  
*It's hot today yone.*

Thus, the single particle proposal can be diagrammed as in (12a):

- (12a) [It's hot today] yone.

and the combination proposal as in (12b):

- (12b) [It's hot today] yo ne.

A number of studies adopts the combination proposal (e.g., Yoshimi, 1997; Makino and Tsutsui, 1986; Maynard, 1993; Takubo and Kinsui, 1997, etc.). In this thesis, we extend the second explanation in an original way and hypothesise that in *yone* constructions, *yo* falls within the scope of *ne* so that the speaker proposes that the figure emerging in the talk satisfies the criterion for having *yo* attached to it (pragmatic property) and thus directs the addressee's acceptance of this situation (sequential function). This account also explains why *neyo* never occurs. This explanation is diagrammed as in (12c).

- (12c) [ [ It's hot today ] yo ] ne.

Because of its function, there are three possible stereotypical developments after

utterances marked with *yone*. Consider:

- (13) 1 Mr Toyota: kyoo tenki ii yone.  
          today weather good yone  
          *It's a nice day today yone.*
- 2 Ms Honda: un.  
                  yes  
                  *Yeah.*
- 3 Mr Toyota: dokka iku?  
                  somewhere go  
                  *Shall we go somewhere?.*

In his first turn, Mr Toyota tells Ms Honda that the weather is nice. At this point, he uses *yone* since he proposes that the figure that the weather is nice satisfies the criterion for having *yo* attached to it, and directs her acceptance of this. In her turn, responding to the 'direct' force of *yone* (i.e. the force of *ne*), Ms Honda shows her acceptance of the status Mr Toyota accords to his comment on the weather. In his second turn, responding to the 'indirect' force of *yone* (i.e. the force of *yo*), he produces an assumptive response, suggesting that they should go somewhere together.

Although strictly the addressee is required only to respond to *ne*, a good conversationalist can and frequently will respond to the force of *yo* as well as to the force of *ne*, as in (14):

- (14) 1 Mr Toyota: kyoo tenki ii yone.  
          today weather good yone  
          *It's a nice day today yone.*
- 2 Ms Honda: un. dokka iku?  
                  yes somewhere go  
                  *Yeah. Shall we go somewhere?*

In addition, there is the further possibility that the speaker sometimes continues a *yone* marked turn with an assumptive response of his own, as in (15):<sup>5</sup>

- (15) Mr Toyota: kyoo tenki ii yone. dokka ikoo ka?  
 today weather good yone somewhere go-Volitional Q  
*It's a nice day today yone. Shall we go somewhere?*

Having proposed a series of hypotheses to account for the functions of the particles *ne*, *yo* and *yone*, we should also consider cases where no particle occurs. In this paper we will therefore hypothesize that *zero* (particle) occurs when the speaker gives no intention as to how the figure emerging in the talk is grounded. This typically occurs after a topic or sub-topic is exhausted and thus indicates that the next speaker may take the conversation in a new direction or that the conversation has come to a natural end. For the sake of completeness, it should be noted that question markers and tags which mark an utterance as the first pair-part of an exchange which requires a conversational second pair-part typically pre-empt the use of sentence-final particles. The table shown below presents a synoptic account of the PFH:

---

<sup>5</sup> We might also explore the difference between (15) and the following putative utterance:

- (15') kyoo tenki ii ø. dokka ikoo ka ø?  
 today weather good somewhere go-Volitional Q  
*It's a nice day today ø. Shall we go somewhere ø?*

However, because it lacks a sentence-final particle, the first utterance in (15') sounds anomalous - it is as if Mr Toyota is not talking to anyone.

	Functions
<i>ne</i>	<i>Ne</i> occurs when the speaker proposes that the figure emerging in the talk should be treated as a ground for the next proposition without further ado, typically in the expectation that the figure is either already known to the addressee or readily acceptable (pragmatic property) and thus directs the addressee's acceptance (sequential function).
<i>yo</i>	<i>Yo</i> occurs when the speaker intends the figure emerging in the talk to be grounded, typically in the expectation that the figure is either new to the addressee or even controversial (pragmatic property) and thus directs an appropriate response by the addressee (sequential function). We will call a response triggered by the force of <i>yo</i> an <i>assumptive</i> response since, as well as being sequentially appropriate, such a response also provides an inferentially related proposition as the next contribution. This response may also be provided by the original speaker.
<i>yone</i>	In <i>yone</i> constructions, <i>yo</i> falls within the scope of <i>ne</i> so that the speaker proposes that the figure emerging in the talk satisfies the criterion for having <i>yo</i> attached to it (pragmatic property) and thus directs the addressee's acceptance of this property (sequential function). In an appropriate context, as well as responding obligatorily to the force of <i>ne</i> , a good conversationalist may also respond to the force of <i>yo</i> .
<i>zero</i>	<i>Zero</i> occurs when the speaker gives no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded (pragmatic property) and thus directs the addressee to regard it as potentially topic closing (sequential function).

**Table 1. The Particle Function Hypothesis (PFH)**

### 2.3.3 The PFH under examination

In this section, we will use the PFH to explore the way that *zero*, *ne*, *yo* and *yone* work in interaction. In doing so, we will employ the notion of utterance function rather than sentence type. This is because the properties of the particles are pragmatic rather than semantic: they occur only in interaction, which by its very nature appeals to pragmatic and sequential rather than semantic notions. Among the various utterance functions, three, asserting, requesting and questioning, are used to illustrate the PFH for the reason that in speech act theory they are prototypically associated with the formal properties of declarative, imperative and interrogative sentences respectively.<sup>6</sup>

Each particle will be examined in turn, and in the examination of each particle each of the three utterance types will be considered.

#### 2.3.3.1 The use of *zero*

*Zero* occurs when the speaker gives no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded (pragmatic property) and thus directs the addressee to regard it as topic closing (sequential function).

##### 2.3.3.1.1 Assertion + *zero*

There are at least four characteristic cases in which the speaker marks an assertion with *zero*, and requires no particular response from the addressee.

---

<sup>6</sup> See Grundy (2000: Chapter 3) and Levinson (1983: Chapter 5) for discussions of the relationship of utterance function types (assertion, request/order, question, etc.) and sentence types (declarative, imperative, interrogative, etc.).



Firstly, the speaker is more likely to mark an assertion with *zero* when he has the intention to do no more than supply the proposition contained in the assertion. A typical case would be a job interview: interviewees generally answer the interviewer's questions about their hobbies, work experience, academic record and so on with assertions marked with *zero*. This is because in such a situation, all they are required to do is to provide the information being asked for, i.e. to answer the questions put to them. In other words, it is considered that each answer in an interview marks the end of a sub-topic and completes the open proposition conveyed in the interviewer's question.

Secondly, the speaker is more likely to mark assertions with *zero* when he intends to show his indifference to the ongoing topic or conversation itself: as *zero* has no sequential force, a *zero*-utterance can bring an ongoing conversation to an end.

Thirdly, the speaker is more likely to mark assertions with *zero* when he is talking to someone to whom he is required to show deference or distance, for example, his teachers, bosses, customers and the like. This is probably because to instruct such persons as to how they should respond to an utterance would go against one of the virtues of Japanese society, modesty.

In these three cases, the speaker chooses and uses *zero* intentionally. There is, however, one case in which *zero* occurs after assertions in a way that seems less intentional: *zero* can occur when the speaker cannot decide immediately how he wants the utterance to be responded to. This happens typically when he responds to an unexpected utterance.

Bearing these four cases in mind, consider:

- (16) Mr Toyota: shuumatsu wa nanika shimashita ka?  
weekend Top something did Q  
*Did you do anything this weekend?*
- Ms Honda: ani to tsuru ni ikimashita ø.  
elder-brother with fishing to went  
*I went fishing with my elder brother ø.*

Mr Toyota asks Ms Honda if she has done anything at the weekend. Answering the question, she tells him that she went fishing with her elder brother. At this point, she uses *zero*. The reason for her choice of *zero* could be any of the above four reasons: it depends on the context in which the utterance occurs, a context which includes her cognitive or/and psychological stance as well as the progress of the conversation up to that point.

#### 2.3.3.1.2 Request + *zero*

A request is typically marked with *zero* because the utterance type as a first pair-part is automatically grounded by the obligatory second pair-part, an acceptance or a refusal. In other words, the utterance type normally pre-empts the use of the particles. [Request + *zero*] will typically be used when people order food in restaurants:

- (17) Customer: koohii o kudasai ø.  
coffee O give-Request  
*Coffee, please ø.*
- Waiter: hai.  
yes  
*Yes.*

In (17), reacting to the force of the request, the waiter shows his acceptance.

Consider also:

- (18) Mr Toyota: kono kopii o ni mai tottekudasai ø.  
this photocopy O two pieces take-Request  
*Please make two copies of this ø.*

Ms Honda: hai.  
yes  
*Yes.*

Mr Toyota asks his secretary, Ms Honda, to make two copies of a document for a meeting.

As in (17), in (18), the secretary also shows her acceptance, reacting to the force of the request.

#### 2.3.3.1.3 Question + zero

A question is typically marked with *zero* because, like a request, the utterance type as a first pair-part is automatically grounded by the obligatory second pair-part, an answer. In other words, the utterance type normally pre-empts the use of the particles. Suppose that Mr Toyota and Ms Honda are at a party. He asks her if the girl standing by the window is Mr Kawasaki's new girlfriend.

- (19) Mr Toyota: asoko ni iru josei kawasaki san no kanojo ø?  
over-there at exist woman Kawasaki Title LK girlfriend  
*Is the lady over there Mr Kawasaki's new girlfriend ø?*

Ms Honda: ee.  
yes  
*Yes.*

Consider also:

- (20) Mr Toyota: eki made donokurai kakarimasu ka ø?  
station to how-long take-(time) Q  
*How long does it take from here to the station ø?*

Police: aruite jippun desu.  
on-foot ten-minutes Cop  
*It takes 10 minutes on foot.*

Suppose that having asked a policewoman the way to the nearest railway station, Mr Toyota now asks her how long it takes to the station by uttering (20).

In both cases, the speaker who asks the question uses *zero* since the question already indicates how the addressee is required to respond.

### 2.3.3.2 The use of *ne*

*Ne* occurs when the speaker proposes that the figure emerging in the talk should be treated as a ground for the next proposition without further ado, typically in the expectation that the figure is either already known to the addressee or readily acceptable (pragmatic property) and thus directs the addressee's acceptance (sequential function).

#### 2.3.3.2.1 Assertion + *ne*

Suppose that Mr Toyota and Ms Honda are talking about the knowledge of their mutual friend Mr Kawasaki.

(21) Mr Toyota: *kawasaki san no atarashii kamigata ii desu ne.*  
Kawasaki Title LK new hairstyle good Cop ne  
*Mr Kawasaki's new hairstyle is nice ne.*

He says to her that Mr Kawasaki's new hairstyle is nice, and adds *ne*. He uses *ne* since he proposes that his comment on Mr Kawasaki's hairstyle should be treated as a ground for the next proposition without further ado and thus directs her acceptance. In other words, he uses *ne* here to establish or maintain their rapport rather than to ascertain the degree to which the figure emerging in the talk resonates with her perspective. In this sense, *ne* can be considered as a rapport marker (cf. Cook, 1992: 526-527). The use of

*ne* in (21) can also be accounted for by the information agreement hypothesis (cf. 2.2.1.1) although not by the territorial information hypothesis (cf. 2.2.1.2) or the discourse processing hypothesis (cf. 2.2.1.3).

Responding to Mr Toyota's utterance in (21), Ms Honda shows her acceptance, saying something like:

- (22) Ms Honda: *soo desu ne.*  
                  *so Cop ne*  
                  *Yeah, it is so ne.*

She conventionally marks her acceptance (i.e. agreement) with *ne* in this sort of situation, thus intensifying their rapport.

After Ms Honda's acceptance, either Mr Toyota or she will probably produce a new figure on the basis of the ground that Mr Kawasaki's hairstyle is nice. Mr Toyota may say that he is thinking of going to the same barber's shop next for his haircut, for example. Or Ms Honda may say that she has heard that the barber has won several haircutting competitions.

*Ne* is added not only to factual statements but also to the speaker's expressions of wishes or desires. Consider:

- (23) Ms Honda: *nani ga tabetai ø?*  
                  *what S want-to-eat*  
                  *What do you like to eat ø?*
- Mr Toyota: *kyoo wa chuuka ryoori ga tabetai ne.*  
                  *today Top Chinese food S want-to-eat ne*  
                  *I want to eat Chinese today ne.*

Suppose that Ms Honda and Mr Toyota are talking about what they are going to eat for lunch. She asks him what he wants to eat, and he expresses the desire to eat Chinese food. At this point, he uses *ne*. This use of *ne* cannot be explained well with the

information agreement hypothesis (cf. 2.2.1.1) since it is still acceptable even when Ms Honda does not know what Mr Toyota wants to eat. Nor can this use of *ne* be explained well with the territorial information hypothesis (cf. 2.2.1.2) since it is hard to think that Mr Toyota's desire falls into Ms Honda's territory rather than his. The discourse processing hypothesis (cf. 2.2.1.3) can possibly provide an account of this use of *ne* if we suppose Mr Toyota is still in the process of deciding what he wants to eat and saying that he wants to eat Chinese helps him to make his mind up. The PFH can also explain this use of *ne* well: by marking his own desire with *ne*, Mr Toyota proposes that his desire should be treated as a ground for the next figure without further ado, and thus directs her acceptance, in the expectation that she will then make a suggestion as to where they might go on the basis of the ground that Mr Toyota wants to eat Chinese. She may say, 'It is so *ne*. Shall we go to the Chinese restaurant next to the bookshop?' It is also possible that Ms Honda will not show her acceptance of the grounding proposal and say that she wants to eat Italian.

The use of *ne* we have examined so far functions as an agreement seeker in the sense that the speaker intends the figure emerging in the talk to be grounded in the expectation that it is also likely to be accepted as a ground by the addressee. In addition, *ne* also functions as a confirmation seeker, when the speaker intends the addressee to confirm information of whose state he is still uncertain and to accept it as a ground.

Suppose that, having been told to pick Ms Honda up by his boss, Mr Toyota comes to Tokyo airport. He and Ms Honda do not know each other, and she does not even know that he is picking her up. Before going to the airport, he studies a photograph of her face and when he sees her coming out of the airport, he says to her:

- (24) Mr Toyota: sumimasen ga honda san desu ne.  
                  sorry           but Honda Title Cop ne  
                  *Excuse me, but you are Ms Honda ne.*

He marks the utterance with *ne*, proposing that the assertion should be treated as a ground for the next figure without further ado, and thus directing her acceptance. In short, he intends her to confirm the accuracy of his proposition.<sup>7</sup> Reacting to the force of *ne*, Ms Honda will probably say:

- (25) Ms Honda: hai soo desu ø.  
                  yes so Cop  
                  *Yes, I am ø.*

When *ne* is used as a confirmation seeker, the addressee who confirms the figure emerging in the talk and indicates that it may be treated as a ground does not use *ne* in her confirming utterance. This is because she does not have to invite the original speaker to accept it as a ground. That is to say, all she is required to do is to confirm what the speaker has asked.

After Ms Honda's acceptance, Mr Toyota is highly likely to produce a new figure. He may say, 'Nice to meet you. I am from Company X, and have come to pick you up'. Or after her own acceptance, Ms Honda may say, 'Are you from Company X?'

---

<sup>7</sup> Although the relation between the particles and intonation has not been fully elucidated yet, it seems that the speaker is more likely to use *ne* with falling intonation when he seeks the addressee's agreement, whereas he tends to use *ne* with rising intonation when he seeks her confirmation.

Consider also:

- (26) 1 Mr Toyota: hidari ni magattekudasai ø.  
left to turn-Request  
*Please turn to the left ø.*
- 2 Taxi Driver: hidari desu ne.  
left Cop ne  
*Left ne.*
- 3 Mr Toyota: hai.  
Yes.  
*Yes.*

Suppose that Mr Toyota is in the taxi and is explaining the way to the taxi driver. Mr Toyota tells the driver to turn to the left and the driver repeats the word 'left' and marks it with *ne*. This is because the driver proposes that the figure emerging in his turn should be treated as a ground. In short, like (25), the driver intends Mr Toyota to confirm the accuracy of his proposition. Reacting to the force of *ne* in the driver's turn, in his second turn, Mr Toyota shows his acceptance of the grounding proposal. That is to say, he confirms that the driver's understanding is correct.

What is interesting about the driver's use of *ne* in line 2 is that s/he proposes that the assertion to be treated as a ground not for a new proposition or speech act but for a non-verbal act, i.e. a turn to the left.

Whereas in (26) *ne* is used when the speaker wants to be sure of his understanding of what the addressee has said, *ne* is also used when the speaker wants to make sure that the addressee understands what he has said. Consider:



- (27) 1 Mr Toyota: sumimasen kono chikakuni yuubinkyoku arimasu ø?  
 sorry this near post-office exist  
*Excuse me, but is there a post-office near here ø?*
- 2 Passer-by: ee. asokoni akai biru ga arimasu ne.  
 yes over-there red building S exist ne  
*Yes. There is a red building over there ne.*
- 3 Mr Toyota: hai.  
 yes  
*Yes.*
- (the instruction continues.)

In the above dialogue, Mr Toyota asks a passer-by where to find a post-office. The passer-by starts an instruction by saying ‘there is a red building over there’. At this point, the passer-by uses *ne*. This is because the passer-by intends to make sure that Mr Toyota follows the instruction. In this case, Mr Toyota’s acceptance in his second turn can be regarded as a confirmation that he understands the instruction.

#### 2.3.3.2.2 Request + *ne*

As mentioned in 2.3.3.1.2, a request is typically marked with *zero* because the utterance type as a first pair-part is automatically grounded by the obligatory second pair-part, an acceptance or a refusal. However, *ne* can be used with a request when the speaker proposes that his request should be treated as a ground in the expectation that the request is either already known to the addressee or readily acceptable and thus invites the addressee’s acceptance of the grounding proposal. Consider:

- (28) Mr Toyota: ashita tanjoobi na n da kedo kite ne.  
 tomorrow birthday Cop Nom Cop and come-Request ne  
*I am having my birthday party tomorrow. Please come ne.*
- Ms Honda: un zettai iku ø.  
 yes absolutely go  
*Yes, I’ll definitely come ø.*

In (28), Mr Toyota uses *ne* after his request, proposing that his request should be treated as a ground in the expectation that the request is readily acceptable and directing Ms Honda's acceptance of his invitation. That is to say, by using *ne*, he shows his expectation that she will comply with his request willingly. If Mr Toyota and Ms Honda are very close friends, *ne* is virtually obligatory. Also, she will probably expect him to use *ne* since she wants him to think that she will show her willingness to comply with his request. However, if they are not especially close, she may think that the way he asks using *ne* is rather pushy since *ne* can indicate that he takes for granted that she will show her willingness to comply. Ikeda (1995: 103) points out that a speaker may give the addressee the impression of being too familiar or pushy if he uses *ne* excessively. Alternatively, if the addressee is the kind of person who finds making friends difficult because of her shyness, she may feel pleased with the speaker's use of *ne* since she is treated as a close friend by the speaker.

Consider also:

(29) Mr Toyota: kono koto wa dare nimo iwanaide ne.  
                   this matter Top anyone to do-not-tell-Request ne  
                   *Please don't tell anyone about this ne.*

Ms Honda: un iwanai ø.  
                   yes will-not-say  
                   *No, I won't ø.*

Suppose that Mr Toyota has just told Ms Honda his secret. He tells her not to tell the secret to anyone and uses *ne*, proposing that his request should be treated as a ground in the expectation that the request is readily acceptable and also directing her acceptance. He could use *zero* instead of *ne* in the same context. However, she might feel uncomfortable with a *zero* utterance since a *zero* utterance does not show his strong expectation that she will show her willingness to comply with his request. That is to say,

the *zero* utterance might imply that she is not the kind of person who can keep a secret.

Orders and commands can be considered to be in the same category as requests in that both utterance types indicate the speaker's desire for the addressee to perform the action expressed in the utterance. However, *ne* does not occur with direct orders/commands. This is probably because the function of *ne* (i.e. acceptance seeking) is inconsistent with the nature of orders/commands, which instruct the addressee to act regardless of their will.

### 2.3.3.2.3 Question + *ne*

As mentioned in 2.3.3.1.3, a question is typically marked with *zero* because the utterance type as a first pair-part is automatically grounded by the obligatory second pair-part, an answer. However, *ne* can be used with questions, when the speaker proposes that his question should be treated as a ground for the next figure without further ado in the expectation that the question is readily acceptable and thus directs the addressee's acceptance of the grounding proposal. Suppose that Mr Toyota and Ms Honda are looking for a good restaurant for lunch, and they are now standing in front of a Chinese restaurant which they have never been to before. He might say:

- (30)    kono resutoran    wa    takai            desu ka ne.  
         this restaurant Top expensive Cop Q    ne  
         *Is this restaurant expensive ne.*

Reacting to the force of *ne*, Ms Honda is likely to show her acceptance of the implicit meaning of his utterance, perhaps by saying:

- (31)    soo desu ne.  
         so    Cop    ne  
         *It is so ne.*

After Ms Honda's acceptance, it is likely that either Mr Toyota or Ms Honda will say something like:

- (32)    haitte mimashoo                                 ka ø?  
        enter try-and-see-Suggestion Q  
        *Shall we go and see ø?*

or

- (33) kono resutoran wa takasoo desu ne.  
this restaurant Top seem-expensive Cop ne.  
*This restaurant seems posh yo.*

Also consider:

- (34) nani ga oishii desu ka ne.  
 what S tasty Cop Q ne  
*What's tasty ne?*

Suppose that Mr Toyota and Ms Honda are going to the U.K. for the first time tomorrow.

In this situation, he may say (34) to her, proposing that the question should be treated as a ground in the expectation that the question is readily acceptable to her, and is a means of sharing his excitement with her. Reacting to the force of *ne*, she shows her acceptance, saying something like:

- (35)    soo desu ne.  
           so    Cop   ne  
           *It is so ne.*

or

- (36)    fisshu ando chippusu o tabenaitoikemasen ne.  
fish     and chips       O must-eat                  ne  
*We must eat fish and chips ne.*

or

- (37) tanoshimi desu ne.  
 enjoyment Cop ne  
*I'm looking forward to it ne.*

### 2.3.3.3 The use of *yo*

*Yo* occurs when the speaker intends the figure emerging in the talk to be grounded, typically in the expectation that the figure is either new to the addressee or even controversial (pragmatic property) and thus directs an appropriate response by the addressee (sequential function). We will call a response triggered by the force of *yo* an *assumptive* response since, as well as being sequentially appropriate, such a response also provides an inferentially related proposition as the next contribution. This response may also be provided by the original speaker.

#### 2.3.3.3.1 Assertion + *yo*

A speaker adds *yo* to an assertion when he intends the addressee to ground the assertion emerging in the talk in the expectation that the assertion is either new to the addressee or even controversial and thus directs an assumptive response by her. Consider:

- (38) kyoo wa sakana ga yasui yo.  
today Top fish S cheap yo  
*Fish is cheap today yo.*

Fishmongers in Japan often try to sell their fish by shouting out remarks such as (38) to those passing in front of their shops. *Yo* is used by a fishmonger since he intends those passing to ground the assertion in the expectation that it is new to them and directs an assumptive response in the next turn. Reacting to the force of *yo* in the fishmonger's utterance, a person may say:

- (39) jaa nanbikika choodai ø.  
in-that-case some-fish give-Request  
*I will buy some, then ø.*

This can be considered a *preferred* assumptive response. Another person may provide a *dispreferred* assumptive response:

- (40) gomennasai. konban sukiyaki na no ø.  
sorry tonight sukiyaki Cop Nom  
*Sorry, we are having sukiyaki tonight ø.*

It is also possible in this context that the fishmonger will react to the force of *yo* in his own assertion: he may say something like:

- (41) katta ø! katta ø!  
buy-Request buy-Request  
*Buy some ø! Buy some ø!*

If *zero* is used instead of *yo* in (38), it sounds as if the fishmonger does not want to receive any response from those passing-by, which would be anomalous in this context.

The hypothesised function of *yo* is evident in the following example:

- (42) Mr Toyota: konban eiga o miniikanai ø?  
tonight movie O go-to-see-Suggestion  
*Why don't we go to see the movie tonight ø?*
- Ms Honda: demo ashita shiken ga auru yo.  
but tomorrow exam S exist yo  
*But we have an exam tomorrow yo.*

In response to Mr Toyota's proposal that they should go to see the movie together, Ms Honda tells him that there is an exam tomorrow. At this point, she uses *yo*, intending the assertion to be grounded in the expectation that it is either new to him or even controversial and thus anticipates an assumptive response in the next turn. A preferred assumptive response from Mr Toyota in this context may be something like:

- (43) a soo datta jaa ikenai ne.  
oh so was in-that-case cannot-go ne  
*Oh, I forgot about that. We can't go to see the movie tonight ne.*

and a dispreferred assumptive response from him may be something like:

- (44) daijoobu da yo. ashita no wa kantan da tte.  
no-problem Cop yo tomorrow one Top easy Cop Complementizer  
*It doesn't matter yo. I think tomorrow's test will be an easy one.*

It is also possible in this context that Ms Honda will react to the force of *yo* in her own assertion, by saying something like:

- (45) dakara benkyooshita hoogaii yo.  
so study should yo  
*So we should study yo.*

or

- (46) ashita ikanai ø?  
tomorrow go-Suggestion  
*Why don't we go tomorrow instead ø?*

Consider:

- (47) kimi wa mada juuni sai da yo.  
you Top still twelve year-old Cop yo.  
*You are still only 12 years old yo.*

(47) might be said by a teacher who finds his student smoking. He uses *yo*, intending the assertion to be grounded in the expectation that it is unwelcome and thus anticipating an assumptive response in the next turn. A preferred assumptive response from the student may be something like:

- (48) wakatta yo. yameru yo.  
understood yo stop yo  
*OK yo. I'll stop smoking yo.*

However, the student may well not produce such a response, but say instead:

- (49) hoka no hito mo sutteiru yo!  
 other LK people also smoke yo  
*Other students also smoke yo!*

since obeying such an order without protesting is considered timid, especially among youngsters. It is also possible in this context that the teacher will react to the force of *yo* in his own assertion, by saying:

- (50) tabako o yamenasai ø.  
 tobacco O stop-Order  
*Stop smoking ø.*

In a paper published in 1997, Takubo and Kinsui suggest that *yo* functions as an inference trigger which directs the addressee's attention towards what may be inferred from the speaker's assertion. However, upon closer examination, we can see that this is not such a convincing hypothesis, since *yo* does not trigger inferences, but rather tends to be frequently added to utterances which already convey a strong implicature. In other words, it is not *yo* that directs the addressee's attention to the speaker's implication, but the combination of the content of his utterance and the context in which it occurs which invites the addressee to infer an implicature. In (47) 'You are still only 12 years old *yo*', the teacher's implicature that 'you should stop smoking' has nothing to do with the existence of *yo*: the implicature comes from the combination of his assertion 'You are still only 12 years old' and the context in which his assertion occurs. Therefore, even if *zero* appears after 'You are still only 12 years old', the same implication would arise, although *zero* in this case would sound somewhat anomalous since it would fail to convey the teacher's intention to elicit a response. What *yo* does is to indicate the speaker's intention that the utterance requires an assumptive response.

Consider the following example:



(51) Mr Toyota: saikin ishida san mita?  
 recently Ishida Title saw  
*Did you see Ms Ishida recently ø?*

Ms Honda: mitenai yo.  
 did-not-see yo  
*No, I didn't yo.*

Suppose that two students Mr Toyota and Ms Honda are talking, and he abruptly asks her if she saw Ms Ishida recently. Having been asked the question, she says 'No, I didn't yo'. In this context, she is likely to use either *zero* or *yo* in her answer. When she uses *zero*, she intends to give him the information he has been asking for (i.e. she did not see Ms Ishida recently) and does not expect to receive any response from him. When she uses *yo*, she intends her reply to be grounded and thus directs an assumptive response in the next turn. The assumptive response in this case from Mr Toyota might be an explanation of why he asked her the question. To put it another way, Honda recognizes that there is an implicature in Toyota's utterance (perhaps that Ms Ishida has transformed her appearance in some way), and she invites him to continue. An exchange of this kind can be considered a typical gossip strategy.

Having being invited to respond to the assertion appropriately, he may say:

(52) kami o pinku ni someta soo da yo.  
 hair O pink to dyed Hearsay Cop yo  
*I heard she dyed her hair pink yo.*

It is also possible in this context that Ms Honda will react to the force of *yo* in her own assertion:

(53) dooshite ø?  
 why  
*Why ø?*

or

- (54) ishida san ni saikin atta no ø?  
Ishida Title to recently saw Nom  
*Did you see her [Ms Ishida] recently ø?*

#### 2.3.3.3.2 Request + $y_o$

In 2.3.3.1.2, we argued that a request normally pre-empts the use of the particles since the utterance type is automatically grounded by the obligatorily second pair-part, an acceptance or a refusal. However, just as *ne* can occur after a request, so can *yo*. By marking a request with *yo*, a speaker intends the request to be grounded in the expectation that the request is either new to the addressee or even controversial and thus directs an assumptive response in the next turn. In other words, *yo* occurs after a request when the speaker is very keen to have the addressee's response.

Consider the following encouragement:

- (55a) ganbatte  $\emptyset$ !  
do-one's-best-Request  
*Do your best  $\emptyset$ ! / Hang in there  $\emptyset$ !*

Parents often cheer their child on in athletic competitions at school, by shouting ‘Hang in there!’<sup>8</sup>. Here they stereotypically use *zero* since they are not interacting with their child and expect no response. However, when they encourage a child who is just about to leave for a competition, they will typically say:

- (55b) ganbatte yo!  
do-one's-best-Request yo  
*Do your best yo! / Hang in there yo!.*

<sup>8</sup> This type of encouragement can be considered to be a kind of request in a broad sense since, as a request does, encouragement also indicates the speaker's desire for the addressee to perform the action expressed in the utterance.

They use *yo* in this case since they do expect an assumptive response to their encouragement. The child will produce a verbal response, probably saying:

- (56) un ganbaru ø.  
yes do-one's-best  
*Yeah, I'll do my best ø.*

or a non-verbal response, such as giving their parents a thumbs-up. It is also possible in this context that the parents will react to the force of *yo* in their own utterance, by saying:

- (57) koko kara ooensuru kara ne  
here from cheer because ne  
*We will cheer you from here ne!*

It is pointed out by some linguists (e.g. Uyeno, 1982) that [order + *zero*] as in (58a) sounds more forceful than [order + *yo*] as in (58b).

- (58a) motto benkyooshinasai ø.  
more study-Order  
*Study harder ø.*
- (58b) motto benkyooshinasai yo.  
more study-Order yo  
*Study harder yo.*

This phenomenon can be explained with reference to the function of *yo* proposed in this thesis. On the one hand, [order + *zero*] indicates solely that all the speaker wants the addressee to do is to study harder. On the other hand, [order + *yo*] can indicate the speaker's intention to draw a response out of the addressee, which can be interpreted as evidence of the speaker's consideration towards the addressee, thus supporting the view that [order + *zero*] is more forceful. However, it also can be interpreted as forcing the addressee to respond (i.e. to produce an assumptive response), thus supporting the view

that [order + *yo*] is more forceful. It seems to the present researcher that whether [order + *zero*] is more or less forceful than [order + *yo*] depends on such factors as context and intonation as well as on the relationship of the interactants.

Consider another example of [request + *yo*]: suppose that a boy has spent two hours cooking Japanese food for his friend. However, she tells him that she cannot eat any more although there is some food left on the table. Responding to her utterance, he may add *yo* to his request to her:

- (59) zenbu tabete yo.  
all eat-Request yo  
*Please eat it all yo.*

intending his friend to ground the request by providing an assumptive response in the next turn. The *zero*-utterance in this case would sound somewhat anomalous since it would fail to convey the boy's expectation of an assumptive response in the next turn, which this context seems to call for. Reacting to the force of *yo* in his request, she may then say:

- (60) wakatta yo. zenbu taberu yo.  
understood yo all eat yo  
*OK yo. I'll eat it all yo.*

If she is short-tempered, she may show her irritation at the force of *yo* in his request, by saying:

- (61) konnani taberarenai yo.  
this-much cannot-eat yo  
*I can't eat so much yo.*

In this context, it is also possible for him to react to the force of *yo* in his own request, by saying:

(62) nanjikanmo kakatta    n    da    yo!  
 many-hours took(time) Nom Cop yo  
*I've spent hours cooking it yo!*

### 2.3.3.3.3 Question + *yo*

In 2.3.3.1.3, we argued that, like a request, a question normally pre-empts the use of the particles since the utterance type is automatically grounded by the required second pair-part, an answer. And indeed, *yo* does not occur after a genuine information-seeking question. However, just as *ne* can occur after a question, so too can *yo*. By marking a question with *yo*, a speaker intends the question to be grounded in the expectation that the request for information the speaker has which underpins his question is either new to the addressee or even controversial, thus directing an assumptive response in the next turn. An assumptive response is typically based on an inference as to the reason why the speaker asked the question.

Consider:

(63) yumiko no koto    kiita ka yo.  
 Yumiko LK matter heard Q    yo  
*Have you heard about Yumiko yo.*

In (63), the speaker marks the utterance with *yo* because he has something assumptive to say in mind. It may be something like:

(64) I heard something interesting about Yumiko.

and the addressee may react to the force of *yo* in the speaker's indirect assertion, by saying:

(65) mata yumiko ga nanika shita no ø?  
 again Yumiko S something did Nom  
*Did Yumiko do something stupid again ø?*

Or the speaker himself may react to the force of it, by saying:

(66) mata shiken chuuni neta soo da yo.  
 again exam during slept Hearsay Cop yo  
*I heard she fell asleep in the exam again yo.*

Consider another example:

(67) ima nanji da yo.  
 now what-time Cop yo  
*What time is it now yo.*

Suppose that a husband says this to his wife when she wakes up at 3 o'clock in the morning and starts watching TV. In such a situation, what he means by uttering (67) is something like:

(68) Don't disturb my sleep.

and the wife may react to the force of *yo* in the husband's indirect request to turn the TV off, by saying:

(69) gomen oto chiisakusuru ø.  
 sorry sound make-(something)-small  
*Sorry, I'll turn the volume down ø.*

Or the husband himself may react to the force, by saying:

(70) nekasete yo.  
 let-me-sleep-Request yo  
*Let me sleep yo.*

The combination of a question and *yo* sounds very casual. This is probably because

questions and *yo* are fundamentally at odds. For this reason, they rarely occur in formal situations or where the speaker is required to show deference or distance, and the combination occurs exclusively in male speech. Accordingly, the main verb or copula in the combination never occurs in polite form.<sup>9</sup>

#### 2.3.3.4 The use of *yone*

In *yone* constructions, *yo* falls within the scope of *ne* so that the speaker proposes that the figure emerging in the talk satisfies the criterion for having *yo* attached to it (pragmatic property) and thus directs the addressee's acceptance of this property (sequential function). In an appropriate context, as well as responding obligatorily to the force of *ne*, a good conversationalist may also respond to the force of *yo*.

##### 2.3.3.4.1 Assertion + *yone*

Consider:

- (71) okaasan ashita kurisumasu da yone.  
mother tomorrow Christmas Cop yone  
*Mom, it is Christmas day tomorrow yone.*

In (71), a child uses *yone* because he intends to direct his mother's acceptance of the fact that the assertion emerging in the talk, that it is Christmas tomorrow, satisfies the criterion for having *yo* attached to it. Reacting to the force of *ne*, the mother will

---

<sup>9</sup> The term 'polite forms' is often used in the teaching of Japanese as a foreign language to describe the '-desu' / '-masu' forms of the auxiliary verbs - the use of these forms being the most basic way for speakers to express courtesy towards interlocutors. For example, *taberu* (plain form - 'to eat') is transformed into *tabemasu* (polite form - 'to eat') and *oishii* (plain form - 'tasty') into *oishiidesu* (polite form - 'tasty') in order to be linguistically 'polite'. For a more comprehensive analysis of Japanese polite forms, see Harada (1976) and Shibatani (1990).

probably show her acceptance, saying:

- (72) soo ne.  
so ne  
*It is so ne.*

She is likely to mark her acceptance with *ne* as in (72) since the use of *ne* in (71) functions as an agreement-seeking marker (see p.36).

After showing her acceptance, she may react to the force of *yo*, saying:

- (73) nani ga hoshii no ø?  
what S want Nom  
*What do you want ø?*

It is also possible for the child to react to the force of *yo* after the mother's acceptance, saying:

- (74) purezento wasurenaide ne.  
present do-not-forget-Request ne  
*Please don't forget to get me a present ne.*

Consider another example. Suppose that Mr Toyota says to his friend Ms Honda:

- (75) chuugokugo ga hanasemasu yone.  
Chinese-language S can-speak yone  
*You can speak Chinese yone.*

By using *yone*, he intends to direct her acceptance that the assertion that she can speak Chinese satisfies the criterion for having *yo* attached to it. Reacting to the force of *ne*, she may say something like:

- (76) ee.  
yes  
*Yeah.*



In her acceptance, she is unlikely to use *ne* in return since the use of *ne* in this example, unlike the use of *ne* in (71), functions as confirmation-seeking marker: the response in (76) explicitly confirms the figure emerging in Mr Toyota's utterance.

If Mr Toyota's motive in (75) is to find someone for a meeting with a Chinese company and is talking about it to Ms Honda, after showing her acceptance, she might react to the force of *yo*, by saying:

(77) *yokattara tetsudaimasu yo.*  
       if-good    help               yo  
       *If you want me to help you, I will yo.*

It is also possible that Mr Toyota will respond to the force of *yo* in his own assertion after Ms Honda's acceptance, saying something like:

(78) *ashita    tetsudattekuremasenka ø?*  
       tomorrow help-Request  
       *Could you help me tomorrow ø?*

It is also possible that Mr Toyota continues a *yone* marked turn with an assumptive response of his own:

(79) *chuugokugo               ga hanasemasu yone.*  
       Chinese-language S   can-speak   yone  
  
       *ashita    tetsudattekuremasenka ø?*  
       tomorrow help-Request  
  
       *You can speak Chinese yone. Could you help me tomorrow ø?*

Consider another example. Suppose that Mr Toyota and Ms Honda are waiting for their mutual friend Mr Kawasaki who has not yet come although the expected time of his arrival has passed. In such a situation, one of the participants may say either of the following:

(80a) moo ichiji desu ne.  
already one-o'clock Cop ne  
*It is already one o'clock ne.*

or

(80b) moo ichiji desu yone.  
already one-o'clock Cop yone  
*It is already one o'clock yone.*

Both (80a) and (80b) can be used to show the speaker's annoyance with Mr Kawasaki's lateness. However, the latter conveys irritation more strongly than the former. This is because the force of *yo* in *yone* implies that the speaker has a further proposition in mind about Mr Kawasaki's lateness, such as 'he's always late' or 'I'm freezing'.

The difference between *ne* and *yone* is especially clear in the differences between the idiomatic agreement-indicating formulas *soo desu ne* (It is so *ne*) and *soo desu yone* (It is so *yone*), both of which frequently occur in Japanese conversation. Suppose that Mr Toyota and Ms Honda are talking and he tells her that the weather is getting worse. As a reply to his utterance, she can say either of the following:

(81a) soo desu ne.  
so Cop ne  
*It is so ne.*

(81b) soo desu yone.  
so Cop yone  
*It is so yone.*

Both utterances show her acceptance of his utterance as a ground. However, because of the force of *yo* in *yone*, (81b) indicates that she has a further proposition to put forward, such as 'I'm supposed to go hiking with my friends this weekend, but we'll probably have to cancel it'. Even if she does not have any further proposition in mind, however, she may use *yone* rather than *ne*, intending to show that the topic satisfies the criterion

that it is worthy of being developed so as to represent herself as being actively involved in the conversation.

#### 2.3.3.4.2 Request + *yone*

The speaker marks a request with *yone* when he intends to direct the addressee's acceptance that the request emerging in the talk satisfies the criterion for having *yo* attached to it. Consider:

- (82) shichiji            madeni kaettekite            yone.  
seven-o'clock by        come-back-Request yone  
*Please come home by seven yone.*

Such a request may be directed by a wife to her husband in the context where her mother-in-law is to visit them at 7 o'clock in the evening. She uses *yone* since she intends to direct his acceptance that her request for him to come home by 7 o'clock is worthy of having *yo* attached to it. Reacting to the force of *ne*, the husband will probably show his acceptance, saying something like:

- (83) un kaettekuru ø.  
yes come-back  
*Yeah, I will ø.*

After showing his acceptance, he might react to the force of *yo*, saying:

- (84) kaasan to futari        kiri ni naritakunai            desho ø?  
mother with two-people only to do-not-want-to-become Tag  
*You don't want to be alone with my mother, right ø?*

It is also possible for the wife to react to the force of *yo* after the husband's acceptance, saying something like:

(85) okaasan to futari kiri ni naritakunai  
 mother with two-people only to do-not-want-to-become  
 kara ∅.  
 because

*Because I do not want to be alone with your mum ∅.*

Consider another example:

(86) shizukanishite yone.  
 be-quiet-Request yone  
*Be quiet yone.*

Suppose that an elder sister who is studying says this to her younger brother who is talking to his friend on a mobile phone in the same room. She uses *yone* because she intends to direct his acceptance that her request for him to be quiet satisfies the criterion for having *yo* attached to it. Reacting to the force of *ne*, the brother will show his acceptance, saying something like:

(87) gomen shizukanisuru ∅.  
 sorry will-be-quiet  
*Sorry, I will ∅.*

After showing his acceptance, he might react to the force of *yo*, saying:

(88) shuuchuudekinai ne.  
 cannot-concentrate ne  
*You can't concentrate ne.*

It is also possible for the sister to react to the force of *yo* after the brother's acceptance, saying:

(89) zenzen shuuchuudekinai yo.  
 at-all cannot-concentrate yo  
*I cannot concentrate at all yo.*

#### 2.3.3.4.3 Question + *yone*

Given that *yo* does not occur after a genuine, i.e. information seeking, question, one would also expect that *yone* would not co-occur with a genuine question. In fact, unlike *yo*, *yone* does not occur even in informal situations or where the speaker is not required to show deference or distance. This is probably because the function of *ne* (i.e. acceptance seeking) is inconsistent with the combination of a question and *yo*, which sounds very casual and occurs only in male speech.

#### 2.3.3.5 *Ne* occurring utterance-internally and independently

It is well known that *ne* occurs not only utterance-finally but also utterance-internally, as in (90).

- (90)    *senshuu    ne honda san    to    hirugohan o tabeniitta    yo.*  
         Last-week ne Honda Title with lunch            O went-to-eat yo  
         *Last week ne I went to a lunch with Mr Honda yo.*

Utterance-internal *ne* is very common in talk-in-interaction in Japanese. Among other linguists, Izuhara suggests that ‘it indicates the speaker’s desire to include the addressee in the talk, and to make sure that the addressee is with the speaker’ (1992: 164) [my translation]. Makino and Tsutsui (1986: 287) claim that ‘*ne* sometimes is used in a non-sentence final position to draw the hearer’s attention to something or to confirm that the hearer has understood what has been said up to that point’. Observing ‘medial’ *ne* from a discourse analytic perspective, Cook states that it does not invite the addressee to agree to the content of the utterance, but ‘can only solicit *aizuchi* (back-channel expressions), verbal or non-verbal cues that signal that the addressee is following what the speaker says’ (1992: 514). Certainly both medial *ne* and *aizuchi* occur together very

frequently in Japanese talk. Indeed, there seems every reason to suppose that there is a significant association between the occurrences of these two phenomena, and that *aizuchi* is a response to an invitation to provide back-channel support which has been solicited by the speaker's use of medial or within-turn *ne*.

Working within a conversation analytic framework, Tanaka discusses the function of utterance-internal *ne*, and argues that 'the use of *ne* in turn-internal places is a means to invite acknowledgements from co-participants, and to display that the speaker has not finished the current turn' (2000: 1158).

Having considered the above, we can argue that utterance-internal *ne* is used to mark not a full utterance but an information unit (Chafe, 1994): utterance-internal *ne* is used when the speaker proposes that the information unit should be treated as a ground for one or more upcoming information units. This hypothesis is still consistent with the function of *ne* proposed in the PFH.

Recall that we argued that the particles are a kind of procedural encoding in Blakemore's sense since they signal how proposition contained in the preceding utterance should be interpreted. We also argued that the particles are not in every respect typical of procedural encodings, since they are required even when the pragmatic intention of an utterance is readily inferable without them, whereas procedural encodings are typically used when the pragmatic intention of the speaker is judged hard to infer without them. With this in mind, utterance-internal *ne* seems to exhibit the characteristic property of procedural encodings in an obvious way. This is because the speaker decides whether or not to employ utterance-internal *ne* at each possible point partly depending on the degree to which the information unit just uttered is expectable. When the speaker changes topic abruptly, say, to what happened to him yesterday, he

may be more likely to mark the word ‘kinoo’ (yesterday) with *ne* so as to secure the addressee’s *aizuchi* before continuing, as in (91):

- (91) kinoo        **ne** kaimono ni itta n dakedo iroiro yasukatta yo.  
yesterday **ne** shopping to went Nom and various were-cheap yo  
*I went shopping yesterday ne, and found several bargains yo.*

In addition to occurring utterance-finally and utterance-internally, *ne* also occurs utterance-independently (Tanaka, 2000). Utterance-independent *ne*, i.e. *ne* occurring in isolation, can be also accounted for by the function of *ne* proposed in the PFH: by using utterance-independent *ne*, the speaker proposes that all of what has been said so far about the topic in the preceding utterance(s) should be treated as a ground for the following utterances, and also directs the addressee’s acceptance of this. Having said that, utterance-independent *ne* may not be frequently responded to overtly since (a) there is no proposition of which the addressee can show acceptance and (b) it functions as an instruction, to rebase the talk, or in Fauconnier’s (1997) terms to construct a new ‘base’ space out of the previous viewpoint and focus spaces. This use of *ne* will be examined with naturally occurring talk data in 4.2.2.5.

## 2.4 Comparison of the use of the particles

This section functions as a summary of the findings reported in the last section with respect to the use of the particles across the three utterance types.

### 2.4.1 The use of the particles with assertions

Consider the following examples:

(92a) kyoo wa ii tenki desu ø.  
today Top good weather Cop  
*It is (will be) a nice day today ø.*

(92b) kyoo wa ii tenki desu ne.  
*It is a nice day today ne.*

(92c) kyoo wa ii tenki desu yo.  
*It is a nice day today yo.*

(92d) kyoo wa ii tenki desu yone.  
*It is a nice day today yone.*

(92a) will be used when the speaker gives no indication as to how the assertion is to be grounded and thus directs the addressee to regard it as (potentially) topic closing. The utterance typically occurs in a monologic discourse such as a weather forecast.

(92b) will be used when the speaker proposes that the assertion should be treated as a ground for the next proposition without further ado, typically in the expectation that the figure is either already known to the addressee or readily acceptable and thus directs the addressee's acceptance. It will typically occur as a greeting when two acquaintances meet in the street. The addressee probably responds, 'Yes it is *ne*', highlighting their rapport.



(92c) will be used when the speaker intends the assertion to be grounded, typically in the expectation that the assertion is either new to the addressee or even controversial, and thus directs an assumptive response in the next turn. A father might direct such an utterance at his daughter who is still in bed at 11 o'clock in the morning, implicitly directing her to get up and do something productive. The daughter may say something like 'I am getting up *yo*!'. It is also possible that the father reacts to the force of *yo* in his own utterance, by saying 'You've got the lawn to weed *yo*!'.

(92d) will be used when the speaker directs the addressee's acceptance that assertion that 'it is a nice day today' satisfies the criterion for having *yo* attached to it. If it appears in the same situation as (92b), the addressee would be expected to do something more than show her acceptance, by also reacting to the force of *yo*. For example, she may say, 'Yes it is *ne*. It is a perfect day to hang washing out to dry *ne*'.

#### 2.4.2 The use of the particles with requests

Consider the following examples:

(93a) *tasukete*  $\emptyset$ .  
 help-Request  
*Please help me  $\emptyset$ .*

(93b) *tasukete ne*.  
*Please help me ne.*

(93c) *tasukete yo*.  
*Please help me yo.*

(93d) *tasukete yone*.  
*Please help me yone.*

(93a) will be used when the speaker intends the request to be treated as no more

than an ordinary request: the utterance type as a first pair-part is automatically grounded by the obligatory second pair-part, an acceptance or a refusal. In other words, the utterance type normally pre-empts the use of the particles. It may typically appear when a man who is drowning calls for help. In this situation, all the speaker wants to do is to be helped.

(93b) will be used when the speaker proposes that the request should be treated as a ground for the next proposition without further ado, typically in the expectation that the figure is either already known to the addressee or readily acceptable and thus directs the addressee's acceptance. Suppose that two friends, Mr Toyota and Mr Matsuda, are walking in the street and see a big dog coming towards them. In this situation, Mr Toyota may say to Mr Matsuda, 'If the dog attacks me, please help me *ne*'. Reacting to the force of *ne*, Mr Matsuda probably shows his acceptance by saying something like 'Of course'.

(93c) will be used when the speaker intends the request to be grounded, typically in the expectation that the request is either new to the addressee or less expectable, and thus directs an assumptive response in the next turn. It may occur if Mr Toyota and Ms Honda are very close friends and he is accustomed to lending her money. The time comes when he has big money problems. He telephones her and asks her to lend him money. However, she says that she does not have any money to lend him. At this point, he may add *yo* to the request. Reacting to the force of *yo*, she may say something like 'OK, I will this time *yo*'. Or she may produce a dispreferred assumptive response such as 'Sorry, I really haven't got any money *yo*'. It is also possible for Mr Toyota to react to the force of *yo* in his own utterance, by saying 'I helped you before *yone*'.

(93d) will be used when the speaker intends to direct the addressee's acceptance

of the fact that the request satisfies the criterion for having *yo* attached to it. It typically appears in the same situation as (93c). Reacting to the force of *ne*, Ms Honda will probably show her acceptance. She may react to the force of *yo* after showing her acceptance, saying ‘Cos you helped me many times *ne*’. It is also possible for Mr Toyota to react the force of *yo* in his own request, saying ‘I helped you before *yone*’.

### 2.4.3 The use of the particles with questions

Consider the following examples.

(94a) *toire wa doko desu ka.*  
toilet Top where Cop Q  
*Where is the toilet ø?*

(94b) *toire wa doko desu ka ne.*  
toilet Top where Cop Q *ne*  
*Where is the toilet ne?*

(94c) *toire wa doko ka yo.*  
toilet Top where Q *yo*  
*Where is the toilet yo?*

(94d) *\*toire wa doko ka yone.*  
toilet Top Cop Q *yone*  
*Where is the toilet yone?*

(94a) will be used when the utterance is a genuine question, in other words, when the speaker wants to receive an answer from the addressee: the utterance type as a first pair-part is automatically grounded by the obligatory second pair-part, an answer. In other words, the utterance type normally pre-empts the use of the particles. (94a) may typically appear when a customer asks a waiter in a restaurant where the toilet is.

(94b) will be used when the speaker proposes that his question should be treated as a ground for the next figure without further ado in the expectation that the question is

readily acceptable and thus directs the addressee's acceptance of the grounding proposal. It may typically be uttered by Mr Toyota when he and Ms Honda are both looking for a toilet in a large park. This utterance is intended not to draw an answer from her, but to invite her agreement that the question is appropriate to the situation. Her response is probably something like 'Where is it *ne*?'.

(94c) will be used when the speaker intends the question to be grounded in the expectation that the request is either new to the addressee or even controversial and thus direct an assumptive response in the next turn. Because of this, *yo* occurs after an indirect assertion or request rather than a true question. An assumptive response is typically based on an inference as to the reason why the speaker asked the question. (94c) may occur in the following situation: Mr Toyota is visiting Ms Honda's room for the first time. They have a few drinks and in due course, he becomes desperate to go to the toilet. Not knowing where it is, he asks her for directions. Although he follows her directions, he cannot find it. Then he may return and say (94c), indirectly criticising her for giving him wrong directions. In this case, the polite form of the copula *desu* cannot occur.

(94d) is ungrammatical for the reason discussed in 2.3.3.4.3.

## 2.5 Summary

The purpose of this chapter has been to investigate the functions of the particles *ne*, *yo* and *yone* and the occurrence of *zero* in interaction. In order to achieve this, first of all, we briefly examined earlier studies on the particles, dividing them into two categories, (a) studies based on the notion of information and (b) studies focusing on the communicative function of the particles. This examination showed that neither category

adequately accounts for the interactive nature of the particles, especially failing to account for the speaker's intention to indicate how his utterance should be responded to in the next or his own continuing turn.

Subsequently, we proposed an account of the functions of the particles (the PFH) which introduced the notions of figure and ground on the one hand and sequentiality on the other. *Zero* occurs when the speaker gives no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded (pragmatic property) thus directing the addressee to regard his turn as topic closing (sequential function). *Ne* occurs when the speaker proposes that the figure emerging in the talk should be treated as a ground for the next proposition without further ado, typically in the expectation that what has been said is either already known to the addressee or readily acceptable (pragmatic property), thus directing the addressee's acceptance (sequential function). *Yo* occurs when the speaker intends the figure emerging in the talk to be grounded, typically in the expectation that the figure is either new to the addressee or even controversial (pragmatic property), thus directing an assumptive response (sequential function). *Yone* occurs when the speaker proposes that the figure emerging in the talk satisfies the criterion for having *yo* attached to it (pragmatic property) and thus directs the addressee's acceptance of this property (sequential function). The particles are thus viewed as markers which have a pragmatic property and a sequential function related to it.

The PFH was then closely examined in relation to the three prototypical utterance types, assertions, requests, and questions. These examinations demonstrated that the proposed hypothesis provided a single, elegant, coherent explanation of the functions of the particles in the three prototypical utterance types.

The PFH was proposed to take account of data that the existing proposals are

unable to explain satisfactorily. However, it has to be admitted the PFH drew on the author's intuition as a native speaker of the language, and not on any empirical evidence. Such a procedure might be thought of as an example of 'rationalistic' or 'decontextualized' pragmatics, of the kind which Kopytko (1995, 2001, 2004) argues against. Despite proposing the PFH in this way, I do agree with Kopytko's argument that conversation is essentially emergent and that 'all sorts of factors (psychological, social or cultural, past and present) may radically influence the S[peaker]'s linguistic behavior. Therefore, the course of linguistic interaction between S[peaker] and H[earer] is unpredictable and the perlocutionary effect uncertain' (1995: 487). For this reason, it should not be expected at this stage that every natural language occurrence of the particles and every response to utterances marked with particles will be predicted by the PFH. At this stage, the PFH should be thought of as indicating the prototypical functions of the particles. At the same time, it should be acknowledged that these functions may be affected by various emergent factors in the course of actual talk-in-interaction. In the following chapters, we will test the validity of the PFH with two different kinds of naturally occurring talk-in-interaction data which I will term unmarked and marked talk-in-interaction types, for reasons that will be explained in the following chapter.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 Introduction

As mentioned in Chapter One, the purposes of the present research are (a) to propose and test a theory of Japanese sentence-final particle usage which acknowledges the interactive nature of the particles and (b) to seek and explain the ‘awkwardness’ NSs feel in interacting with NNSs in relation to particle use. In order to accomplish these purposes, in Chapter Two we reviewed a range of studies on the particles, and argued that the existing literature contains no persuasive hypotheses capable of accounting for the pragmatic functions of the particles, for their frequency and for the fact that they are found only in talk-in-interaction. In order to address this problem, we proposed an original Particle Function Hypothesis (PFH) formulated from a rationalistic perspective, yet at the same time taking into account the notion of sequentiality: we hypothesised that the particles are linguistic markers which indicate how the utterances in which they occur should be responded to in the continuing interaction (whether next turn or continuing turn). Having set up the PFH in this way in Chapter Two, in Chapters Four and Five we will turn to the question of how its validity can be tested in an empirical examination of NS-NS talk.

The purpose of this chapter is then to explain the research steps taken in the research reported in the chapters that follow. The chapter is divided into four parts. The

first (3.2) will briefly explain how the present study is intended to be viewed in terms of two different kinds of pragmatics, rationalistic and empirical pragmatics. The second (3.3) will explain the methodology, i.e. the general approach adopted to studying the research topic (Silverman, 1993: 1). The third (3.4) will explain how data were collected. The fourth and final (3.5) will explain the procedure of data analysis and deal with related issues.

### **3.2 Rationalistic and empirical pragmatics**

In articles published in 1995, 2001 and 2004, Kopytko argues against rationalistic pragmatics and states the need for an empirical pragmatics. A fundamental requirement in an empirical pragmatics is that observational adequacy should be achieved with respect to the data. Although the underlying perspective of the present research is rationalistic, the researcher respects empirical data and is only accepting a rationalistic hypothesis in the expectation that it can be fully tested by empirical data. Kopytko criticises in particular Brown and Levinson (1987) for adapting a rationalistic and deterministic stance from the outset in postulating a formula which shows how ‘model persons’ use linguistic politeness strategies and then providing data which exemplify the strategies they postulate; in fairness to Brown and Levinson (1987), the data they use represent characteristic formulas in three unrelated languages and in one sense are based on observation. However, the problem is that the data are presented as idealized, decontextualized formulas. This methodology therefore lays them open to the charge of selecting data which support their hypothesis. The present research is rationalistic in the sense that the researcher began, not with empirical data, but with invented examples which were used to set up a hypotheses (or, strictly, a series of hypotheses). However, he



then collected empirical data in order to test these hypotheses. There is a subtle difference between the way the present research is conducted and the way Brown and Levinson investigate politeness phenomena. Furthermore, the present researcher hopes that the approach followed in this investigation could be viewed as a standard way of connecting rationalistic theoretical and empirical/data-driven pragmatic methods.

### **3.3 Choosing a methodology**

Having completed the literature review of particles and set up his PFH, the researcher next considered the best way to test the validity of the hypothesis empirically as a first step in the pursuit of examining how particle use is related to awkwardness in NNS speech. At this stage, the issue arises as to whether a quantitative or qualitative methodology is more appropriate.

Quantitative research is concerned with large-scale social trends and connections between variables seen from a macro point of view (Bryman, 2001: 285), and is typically used to ‘show how commonly or frequently certain patterns crop up’ (Wray, Trott and Bloomer, 1998: 96). In contrast, qualitative research is concerned with small-scale aspects of social reality, such as interaction, seen from a micro point of view (Bryman, 2001: 285), and is typically concerned with ‘the types of strategies - the qualities - in the data and ascertaining why particular speakers used them in specific contexts with particular people’ (Wray *et al.*, 1998: 95).

The researcher decided to employ a qualitative approach rather than a quantitative one. This is because a qualitative approach, which enables the researcher to examine the sequential nature of talk-in-interaction in a holistic way, is more suited to an examination of the phenomenon under investigation, the particles *ne*, *yo* and *yone*, which occur

exclusively in interaction: to understand the particles it is necessary to understand the linguistic context, and particularly how preceding utterances help to determine the use of particles and how the ways the particles occur influence following utterances in talk-in-interaction.

Employing a qualitative approach generally leads researchers to concentrate their analysis on a small number of cases. The present research also follows such practice and examines these cases in close detail. Two of the three cases investigated test the validity of the PFH and the third examines non-nativeness in JSL particle use. In this sense, the present research can be regarded as three related case studies. In conducting a case study, there is one issue which is often questioned, especially among quantitative researchers, that is, its generalizability (Blaxter, Hughes and Tight, 2001: 221; Dey, 1993: 261; Flick, 1998: 233-234).

It is not disputed that case studies are not suitable for revealing representative findings since such findings are based on a small number of cases selected out of a large number of potential cases. This may be also applied to the present research: the tendencies in the particle use of the participants in the cases selected for the study may not be replicated in other possible cases since each person represents an array of variables such as age, gender, geographic, social background, psychological stance, and so on, and such differences may influence the ways they use the particles. Furthermore, the situation in which conversation take place also influences how the particles occur, as the next two chapters will demonstrate. However, each case is equally capable of testing and validating the hypothesis and there is every reason to suppose that the hypotheses can account for particle uses in a variety of situations.

With reference to this issue, some qualitative researchers claim that generalization

is not an issue in qualitative research for the reason that qualitative research is simply descriptive, insisting that each case is ‘of interest in all its particularity and ordinariness’ (Stake, 1994: 236). The present researcher agrees with this view only to the extent that he makes no claim that the findings of the talk data analysed in the present research represent the generality of talk-in-interaction in Japanese. Whilst findings gained from case studies should not be generalized without care, he believes that the talk data analysed in the present research provide a basic understanding of how turns and sequences are constructed in the course of interaction (cf. Mori, 1999: 19) and how the particles are associated with such phenomena. This is because the basic structures of social order are to be found anywhere (cf. Silverman, 2000: 108) and the three different cases analysed in the present research must be relatable to similar cases (Bell, 1999: 13).

### **3.4 Data collection**

As mentioned above, three cases of talk-in-interaction data were collected in the present research, two of which were used to demonstrate the validity of the PFH and one of which was used to examine how the particles are related to the ‘awkwardness’ NSs feel in interacting with NNSs. In this sub-section, we will examine firstly how the researcher selected the types of talk-in-interaction for analysis, and then how the talk data were collected.

#### **3.4.1 Selecting talk types**

First of all, the researcher collected NS-NS talk data in order to test the validity of the PFH. Before setting about data collection, the researcher speculated as to what types

of talk-in-interaction were suitable for testing the validity of the PFH.

Levinson proposes the notion of 'activity type' and defines it as 'a fuzzy category whose focal members are goal-defined, socially constituted, bounded events with constraints on participants, setting, and so on, but above all on the kinds of allowable contributions' (1979: 368). Levinson argues that 'social events come along a gradient formed by two polar types, the totally pre-packaged activity on the one hand (for example, a Roman Mass) and the largely unscripted event on the one hand (for example a chance meeting on the street)' (ibid. 1979: 368).

In order to show that the PFH is explanatorily adequate in different types of talk event, the researcher decided to collect two different types of talk-in-interaction, a typical instance of everyday talk-in-interaction and an extreme instance of goal-directed talk-in-interaction (cf. Denscombe, 1998: 33). These talk types are different in that the communicative goal of the former is intrinsic, to the extent that any goals that might be identified arise during the talk rather than exist prior to it, whereas the communicative goal of directed talk-in-interaction is extrinsic to the communication event and pre-exists it. We may call the former 'unmarked' talk-in-interaction and the latter 'marked' talk-in-interaction, with 'marked' used to describe increasingly particularly directed talk type.

Thus the researcher felt the need to study two types of talk-in-interaction and in particular to consider goal-directedness. This is because the PFH regards the particles as markers which indicate how the utterance in which the particles occur should be responded to, and the ways such markers are used was expected to differ considerably depending on the degree of goal-directedness of each example of talk-in-interaction: the more goal-directed talk-in-interaction is, the more manipulative participants were

expected to be in their use of the particles, controlling the direction of the conversation so as to achieve their communicative goals. Despite what was said earlier about the generalizability of case study results, the PFH is only useful to the extent that it fully accounts for all types of talk, whether ‘unmarked’ or ‘marked’, in much the same way that we expect a syntax or phonology to account for all and only the possible forms of a language. Although the researcher accepts the possibility of emergence as discussed by Kopytko, in contradistinction to Kopytko’s position, he assumes that emergence is not an accident: one can explain why a particular emergent event occurs, considering various factors such as speaker’s cognitive processes, psychological condition and so on.

In addition to two different types of NS-NS talk-in-interaction, the researcher collected NS-NNS talk-in-interaction data in order to examine how the particles are related to the ‘awkwardness’ NSs feel in interacting with NNSs, and more specifically, how the NNS who fails to act in accordance with the PFH causes problems for the NS who tries to follow it. As data for such a purpose, the researcher chose everyday incipient talk rather than goal-oriented talk since the examination of representative everyday talk is more useful from a pedagogic perspective in the sense that it is more generic.

### **3.4.2 Collecting Data**

As explained in the previous section, for the present research, three different kinds of talk-in-interaction data were collected for analysis: an extended instance of NS-NS everyday talk-in-interaction data, an extended instance of NS-NS goal-oriented talk-in-interaction data, and an extended instance of NS-NNS everyday talk-in-interaction data. The methods used in collecting these data will be explained below. Before doing so, we will initially examine how the researcher dealt with the ethical issue

of consent that arises in natural language data collection and will describe the techniques employed in recording the talk data collected.

#### **3.4.2.1 Ethical consideration**

As Grundy (2000: 221) says, there are three choices in recording naturally occurring talk: (1) 'to obtain the prior consent of our informants before we collect data from them', (2) 'to ask permission to use the data after they have been collected', and (3) 'not to ask permission at all'. Considering the data collection for the present research, first of all the third option was eliminated on ethical grounds. The second option is superior to the first one in that it can eliminate any influence of recording on the way the informants communicate since they are unaware of the recording during the conversation. However, there are at least two potential problems with this option. Firstly, some people may still consider it unacceptable to record other people's talk without their prior consent even though it is intended that consent is asked for after the event. Secondly, it is possible that participants may refuse to allow the recorded data to be used when their prior consent has not been sought. Having considered the above, in collecting NS-NS and NS-NNS everyday talk data, the first choice was exercised; although the first choice cannot eliminate the potential problem that the participants' awareness of being recorded influences the way they talk, it enables the researcher to avoid both ethical and possible consent problems. This approach also enables the researcher to ask the informants to record their conversation wherever and whenever the appropriate opportunity arises.

As explained later in this chapter, as well as NS-NS and NS-NNS everyday talk data, NS-NS radio phone-in exchange data were also collected for the present research. The use of this kind of 'public' resource may involve an issue of copyright. However,

following the research conventions in the field of linguistics, the researcher did not ask the broadcasting station for its consent for some parts of the exchange to be transcribed and used in the doctoral dissertation. Instead the name of the radio program and the broadcasted date are specified at appropriate places in the dissertation.

#### **3.4.2.2 Recording techniques**

As for recording, there are two ways of recording naturally occurring talk data, video-recording and audio-recording. Both have their advantages and disadvantages. On the one hand, video-recording helps to ensure an accurate ascription of data to particular speakers, especially when there are three or more speakers, and it also enables the researcher to examine extralinguistic features of interaction such as nodding, eye contact, gesture and so on. On the other hand, in most circumstances, audio-recording supplies data with better quality sound than video simply because an audio recorder can be placed nearer to the subjects than a video recorder. Also, informants tend to pay less attention to an audio recorder than a video recorder while their conversation is being recorded. Audio recorders are also more practical than video recorders in the sense that the former are easy to carry and use. This is a very important consideration in research such as this when participants are asked to record their own talk-in-interaction. For the reasons mentioned above, an audio recorder was employed in collecting two different types of everyday talk data. As a result of the non-participant observation research technique used, it was possible to eliminate the possibility that the presence of the researcher might influence the way the participants talked.

### **3.4.2.3 NS-NS everyday talk-in-interaction**

In order to collect NS-NS everyday talk data, the researcher asked one of his female Japanese acquaintances in the United Kingdom to record a conversation with a friend when the chance presented itself. Neither of the participants was informed of the researcher's area of investigation at the time of recording. Some weeks later she passed him a minidisc containing a conversation with a close female friend which had taken place when the friend visited her flat for dinner in December, 2001. After the recording, the participants gave the researcher unconditional permission to make use of the data in any ways he thought appropriate.

The collected data can be considered as an unmarked type of talk-in-interaction on account of their everyday, non-scripted nature. The length of the conversation was fifty minutes. As a first principle, the researcher avoided using the first several minutes of the exchange because of the possibility that the participants were more sensitive to the existence of a minidisk recorder at that stage. Having listened to the data several times, he selected a six minute-extract for analysis, following Silverman's maxim: to 'make a lot out of a little' (2000: 102). The extract was selected because the particles occurred more frequently than in other potential extracts of a similar length.

### **3.4.2.4 NS-NS goal-oriented talk-in-interaction**

In order to test the explanatory adequacy of the PFH in goal-directed talk-in-interaction, the researcher made use of a public resource, a six-minute radio phone-in exchange in a game show programme *Suzuki Talking F. M.* broadcast on July 23,



2000.<sup>1</sup> The whole of a simple talk-in-interaction episode was transcribed and analysed. In the exchange, a popular male singer, *Masaharu Fukuyama*, acting as presenter, interviews a caller who has recently been ‘dumped’ by his partner, with a view to selecting him as a potential partner in a new ‘happy couple’ to be brought together from among the various callers.

This exchange can be considered as goal-directed in that the participants’ intentionality in the use of language is more apparent and the goals of the participants are extrinsic; the host needed to discover enough about the caller to determine whether he would make an appropriate person to invite to the studio. For his part, the caller needed to make the right impression on the host in order to secure an invitation. In addition to this, the game-show phone-in host is responsible for making the exchange entertaining for the overhearing audience.

### **3.4.2.5 NS-NNS everyday talk-in-interaction**

Having tested the validity of the PFH with two different types of talk-in-interaction involving NSs, the researcher then collected another instance of everyday talk involving a NS-NNS interaction so as to examine non-nativeness in JSL particle use.

In order to focus on unexpectedness only in relation to particle use and responses to utterances in which the particles occur, the researcher searched for a NNS with a very good command of the spoken language at the phonological, syntactic and pragmatic levels, and eventually chose a British male, one of the researcher’s former students. This informant had been studying Japanese for several years and had returned to the UK in the

---

<sup>1</sup> The programme website address is <http://www.tfm.co.jp/talkingfm/>.

summer of 2002 after spending a year studying Japanese in the northern city of Sendai. Shortly after these data were obtained, the informant won the first prize in the student category of the Sir Peter Parker Japanese Speech Contest Awards held in London in February in 2003<sup>2</sup>. This award provides independent corroboration of his first-class command of the spoken language.

The researcher asked the JSL informant to record a conversation with a Japanese friend when the chance presented itself. Neither of the participants was informed of the researcher's area of investigation at the time of recording. Some weeks later the researcher received a minidisc from the JSL participant containing a 74 minute conversation with a female NS friend from Tokyo. The conversation took place when the friend visited the JSL participant's flat in December, 2002. At the time of recording, he was 26-years-old and she was 21-years-old. The researcher followed the same practice as with the NS-NS everyday talk data and avoided using the first several minutes of the data. He selected an extract of approximately five minutes duration which occurred several minutes from the start of recording, and in which the particles occurred more frequently than in other potential extracts of a similar length.

### **3.5 Data analysis**

Having decided to employ a qualitative approach to the talk-in-interaction data to be collected, the researcher next considered how the data might be most appropriately analysed.

---

<sup>2</sup> See <http://jetro.co.uk/sppa/index.html> for the details of the contest.

### 3.5.1 Intentionality and inference

It was proposed in the PFH that by using the particles, the speaker shows his *intention* as to how the utterances in which the particles occur should be understood by the addressee, particularly in terms of the notion of the figure/ground distinction. We call this the pragmatic property of the particles. *Intentionality* in language use has been extensively studied in the field of pragmatics, especially in the area of speech acts (e.g., Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969, 1979). In his well-known book *How to Do Things with Words* (1962), Austin divides the act of saying something into three aspects: the first aspect is the *locutionary act*, uttering a sentence with determinate sense and reference. The second is the *illocutionary act*, performing an act by uttering a sentence. The third is the *perlocutionary act*, the effect on the audience of uttering a sentence. Within speech act theory the particles *ne*, *yo* and *yone* may be thought of as *illocutionary particles* (cf. Goddard, 1998: 169) in the sense that they have the force to direct the addressee as to how to understand the speaker's pragmatic intentions. To put it another way, in order to become competent in the use of the particles, one has to understand their pragmatic effect.

However, even when the speaker uses the particles to show his intention as to how he wants the addressee to understand the utterances in which the particles occur, if the addressee does not understand it, the exchange will obviously fail. In order to have a successful exchange, the addressee must *infer* the speaker's intention. Like intentionality, *inference* has been also exhaustively researched in the field of pragmatics. Although there is still a major discussion as to whether inference of this kind involves an inductive process (e.g., Grice, 1975, 1978) or a deductive process (e.g., Blakemore, 1992; Sperber and Wilson, 2001; Wilson and Sperber, 1993), either way enables the addressee to derive the implicit meaning of an utterance by inference. That is to say, in order to respond

competently to the utterances in which the particles occur, one has to infer the speaker's intended pragmatic intention in marking utterances with a particular particle.

Thus the notion of intentionality is at the heart of pragmatics viewed from a speaker's point of view, whereas inference is at the heart of pragmatics viewed from an addressee's point of view (cf. Thomas, 1995: 58). In optimality theory terms, the speaker seeks an optimal form for a meaning and the addressee seeks an optional meaning for a form (Blutner, 2004; Blutner and Zeevat, 2004).

In this study, the researcher will demonstrate how these fundamental pragmatic behaviours are achieved in the use of the sentence-final particles under investigation.

What remains to be shown is how the speaker (and the researcher) can know whether or not the addressee has successfully inferred the speaker's intention as encoded by a particular particle. This question will be answered in the following sub-section.

### **3.5.2 Conversation analysis**

The PFH proposed that the particles have not only pragmatic properties but also sequential functions, which result from the speaker showing his intention as to how the utterance in which the particle occurs should be responded to. However, the pragmatic and sequential functions are not separate but rather undividable: the pragmatic force of the particles inevitably brings about a sequential function. That is to say, the way the addressee responds to the sequential force of the particles will indicate whether or not she has successfully inferred the speaker's pragmatic intention (i.e. how the speaker intends the addressee to understand the utterance in which the particle occurs). Some useful analytic techniques for examining how the addressee responds to the sequential force of the particles can be found in conversation analysis (hereafter CA).

CA is the qualitative analytic method most frequently applied to talk-in-interaction data. It originated from *ethnomethodology*, a sociological approach mainly developed by ethnologists such as Goffman (1959, 1981) and Garfinkel (1967, 1972) and employed in the analysis of talk data by Sacks and his colleagues, notably Schegloff and Jefferson. In CA 'participants in conversation are seen as mutually orienting to, and collaborating in order to achieve, orderly and meaningful communication' (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998:1). For this reason, CA attaches great importance to the notion of *sequentiality*: one of its aims is to discover 'how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns at talk, with a principal focus being on how sequences of activities are generated' (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998:14). Given that sentence-final particles are clearly associated with sequentiality of this sort in the PFH, CA would appear to be a natural method to employ in the study of these particles.

In addition, CA also provides the researcher with a basic but powerful analytic tool of talk-in-interaction, *a next-turn proof procedure*: in order to 'ensure that analyses explicate the orderly properties of talk as oriented-to accomplishments of participants, rather than being based merely on the assumptions of the analyst' (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998: 15), what happens in the next turn is examined thoroughly in CA. This procedure is based on the sequential nature of talk-in-interaction, as indicated:

...throughout the course of a conversation or other bout of talk-in-interaction, speakers display in their sequentially 'next' turns an understanding of what the 'prior' turn was about. That understanding may turn out to be what the prior speaker intended, or not; whichever it is, that itself is something which gets displayed in the next turn in the sequence. (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998: 15)

Schiffrin also refers to this point in a clear manner:

From a speaker's point of view, next position ... offers a location in which to find the recipient's analysis of the utterance - to see whether an anticipated response is confirmed. From a recipient's point of view, next-position offers an opportunity to reveal aspects of the understanding of prior talk to which own talk will be addressed. ... Thus, next-position is a crucial location for the building of intersubjectivity (1994: 237).

This procedure is also clearly beneficial to the examination of the particles, which show the speaker's intention as to how the utterances in which they occur should be responded to next. If this supposition is correct, the functions of the particles can be detected only by examining what happens after the utterances in which they occur. By adopting this procedure, the researcher is thus able to examine carefully how the particles function by examining what occurs in the next turn.

### **3.5.3 Data analysis procedures**

Having collected talk data and decided to employ CA techniques in analysing them, the researcher first analysed the typical instance, i.e. the NS-NS everyday talk data, and then the marked instance, i.e. the NS-NS goal-directed talk data in order to test the validity of the PFH. Subsequently, in order to understand and seek to explain how the particles are related to the 'awkwardness' NSs feel in interacting with NNSs, he collected and analysed the NS-NNS everyday talk data. In analysing each type of talk data, he first transcribed the data orthographically, then represented them in English with both narrow and broad glosses, and finally analysed them. The details of the analytic procedure will be explained below.

### **3.5.3.1 Transcription**

After collecting each Japanese talk-in-interaction data set, the researcher transcribed them orthographically with a minimal set of transcription notation symbols (See introductory page x for Abbreviations and Symbols used in Transcriptions). The researcher decided not to employ the detailed orthographic transcripts with a wide range of symbols<sup>3</sup> typically used in CA. This is because the purpose of the present research, i.e. to provide a pragmatic account of the functions of the particles from an empirical perspective, does not require transcriptions to be as exhaustive as in, say, CA. ‘The researcher’s aim is to try to find a minimal, or most parsimonious, standard representation which presents the data with as little interpretation as possible’ (Grundy, 2000: 193), and to ‘highlight analytically relevant features of talk-in-interaction’ (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998: 88).

### **3.5.3.2 Representation of data in English**

After transcribing the Japanese talk data, the researcher was then faced with the question of how to represent them in English so as to make them accessible to non-Japanese readers. Non-English talk data have been represented in English journals mainly in two different ways. Some linguists (e.g., Cook, 1997; Hayashi, 1991; Kumatoridani, 1999; Nishimura, 1995; Suzuki, 1999 for Japanese, and Blum-Kulka, Blondheime & Hachohen, 2002; Fasulo & Zucchermaglio, 2002; Laforest, 2002; Piazza, 2002 for other languages) present the data with only a free gloss, as in the (A) and (B) styles below:

---

<sup>3</sup> See Schiffrin (1994: 423-433) for overview of the principal different sets of transcription symbols in use in CA.

(A)

- 1P: e:: donna shigoto o yatteiru n desu ka ima ø? =  
Er:: what kind of job do you do now ø?  
2J: = a (.) fukushi kei na n desu yo:. =  
Oh (.) my job is to do with welfare yo.  
3P: = a::: kokoro no yasashii hito da:: ø.  
O:::h you are a kind person ø.

(B)

- 1P: e:: donna shigoto o yatteiru n desu ka ima ø? =  
2J: = a (.) fukushi kei na n desu yo:. =  
3P: = a::: kokoro no yasashii hito da:: ø.  
  
1P: Er:: what kind of job do you do now ø? =  
2J: = Oh (.) my job is to do with welfare yo. =  
3P: = O:::h you are a kind person ø.

Such kinds of transcription may be adequate in the case that the research does not demand a high level of detailed discussion of data. However, they are insufficient when detailed microanalysis of verbal interaction is necessary. For example, they do not satisfactorily address issues of projectability, so that it may appear from the free gloss that ‘an overlap occurs at a point where the first speaker’s thought is still incomplete, but, for a native, the overlap may occur at a point where the remainder of the utterance is projectable’ (Bilmes, 1996: 172).

However, issues of projectability may be improved by presenting a word-by-word translation as well as a free gloss (Bilmes, 1996: 172). Such transcriptions can be seen in e.g., Honda, 2002; Ide, 1998; Lee, 2002; Lerner & Takagi, 1999; Matsui, 2002; Mori, 1999; Suzuki, 1998; for Japanese, and Golato, 2002; Kangasharju, 2002; Koutlaki, 2002 for other languages, as in the (C) and (D) styles:



(C)

1P: e:: donna shigoto o yatteiru n desu ka ima ø? =  
 er what-kind-of job O doing Nom Cop Q now  
 Er:: what kind of job do you do now ø?

2J: = a (.) fukushi kei na n desu yo:. =  
 oh welfare relation Cop Nom Cop yo  
 Oh (.) my job is to do with welfare yo.

3P: = a:: kokoro no yasashii hito da:: ø.  
 oh heart LK kind person Cop  
 O::h you are a kind person ø.

(D)

1P: e:: donna shigoto o yatteiru n desu ka ima ø? =  
 er what-kind-of job O doing Nom Cop Q now

2J: = a (.) fukushi kei na n desu yo:. =  
 oh welfare relation Cop Nom Cop yo

3P: = a:: kokoro no yasashii hito da:: ø.  
 oh heart LK kind person Cop

1P: Er:: what kind of job do you do now ø? =  
 2J: = Oh (.) my job is to do with welfare yo. =  
 3P: = O::h you are a kind person ø.

In the present research, style (D) was selected because of the different parameter settings of the languages involved, thus avoiding the possibility that the (C) style English gloss of an interrupted utterance in which an object but not a verb had occurred prior to the interruption would be hard to follow. The following example shows the advantage of the (D) style in this respect:

1P: e:: syumi wa ø?  
 er hobby Top

2J: u::nto (.) ima kanuu ya-,  
 er now canoe

3P: ka[nuu ø?]  
 canoeing

4J: [yaroo ] yaroo to omotteiru n desu yo. =  
 do-Volitional do-Volitional Comp thinking Nom Cop yo

4J is a continuation of 2J: 2J conveys the object 'now canoeing' and 4J the verb '(I am) thinking of starting'. Considering this, let us compare the different styles:

(C)

2J: u::nto (.) ima kanuu ya-,  
er now canoe  
Er: (.) now canoeing,  
3P: ka[nuu ø?]  
canoeing  
Canoeing ø?  
4J: [yaroo ] yaroo to omotteiru n desu yo. =  
do-Volitional do-Volitional Comp thinking Nom Cop yo  
I am thinking of starting yo. =

The (C) style fails to represent the ‘regularity’ of English VO order in its English free gloss in which the object (canoeing) comes before the verb (starting). This is because the English free gloss of the proposition which spreads over lines 2 and 4 separates the two parts. The (D) style can solve this problem:

(D)

2J: u::nto (.) ima kanuu ya-,  
er now canoe  
3P: ka[nuu ø?]  
canoeing  
4J: [yaroo ] yaroo to omotteiru n desu yo. =  
do-Volitional do-Volitional Comp thinking Nom Cop yo  
2-4J: Er: (.) I am thinking of starting canoeing now yo. =  
3P: Canoeing ø?

Although the gloss of line 3 comes after that of line 4, the (D) style conveys a more accurate representation of the proposition in lines 2 and 4 for the English reader in that the ‘regularity’ in the object-verb order of Japanese can be reversed in its English free gloss, thus allowing a representation which is natural for English in just the same way that the original representation was natural for Japanese.

### 3.5.4 Segmental vs. holistic analysis

Contrary to the method employed in most studies of the particles, the researcher scrupulously avoided extracting single utterances or very short exchanges in which target particles occurred. Instead, he chose to use extended exchanges in order to represent the sequential function of the particles in full. For this reason, in Chapters Four and Five, whose main purposes were to test the validity of the PFH, the particles, *ne*, *yo* and *yone* are not examined in individual sections: rather each extract examined contains various particles. In Chapter Six, where the main purpose was to study how the particles were related to the awkwardness in NS-NNS interaction, a slightly different analytic technique was used: although the sequential nature of talk-in-interaction was still maintained, the particles were examined in individual sections. This is because the researcher intended to highlight in a clear manner the difference in the NNS's competence in using and responding to the various particles .

## 3.6 Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to explain the methodological techniques employed in the three empirical chapters that follow. This chapter was divided into four parts: the first illustrated how the present study is intended to be viewed in terms of two different kinds of pragmatics, rationalistic and empirical pragmatics; we argued that the present research is rationalistic in the sense that the researcher began with invented examples which were used to set up the PFH, and is also empirical in the sense that empirical data were collected in order to test these hypotheses. We then proposed that the approach followed in this investigation could be viewed as a standard way of connecting

rationalistic theoretical and empirical/data-driven pragmatic methods.

The second explained the approach employed for the analysis of empirical talk data. A qualitative rather than quantitative approach was chosen since it enables a micro-analysis of empirical talk-in-interaction data to be conducted and allows the researcher to examine *how* the participants in talk-in-interaction use the particles and respond to utterances in which the particles occur.

The third section of the chapter discussed data collection and explained how, in the following three empirical chapters, three different types of talk data, NS-NS everyday talk, NS-NS goal-oriented talk, and NS-NNS everyday talk, were collected: the first two were used to test the validity of the PFH and its explanatory adequacy in different talk types, and the third data set was collected to enable the researcher to investigate the non-nativeness of JSL speakers in relation to their response to and production of the particles *ne*, *yo* and *yone* and the problems this causes a NS interactant operating in accordance with the PFH. Before collecting NS-NS and NS-NNS everyday talk data, the researcher obtained the informants' consent for their conversations to be recorded and also for the collected talk data to be used for any research purpose. In addition, in order to collect as natural talk as possible, non-participant audio-recording rather than video-recording was employed.

The fourth section discussed data analysis. Firstly we examined two central notions in pragmatics, intentionality in language use and inference in language understanding, and argued that the former is indispensable in analysing the pragmatic properties of the particles from the speaker's perspective, and the latter from the addressee's perspective. Secondly, we considered how the sequential functions of the particles should be examined empirically, and turned to conversation analysis which

provides a method that enables a microanalysis of talk-in-interaction to be conducted. We argued that the next-turn proof procedure is particularly useful in examining talk in terms of sequentiality. Thirdly, we discussed data analysis procedures; this sub-section showed that the data were transcribed with the minimal set of transcription notation symbols sufficient to provide a pragmatic and sequential analysis of the use of the particles. In addition, we examined how the Japanese talk data were represented in English and how the researcher resolved the issue of representing SOV original talk in an SVO order language. Finally, we discussed the researcher's strategy in choosing to use extended exchanges rather than single utterances or very short exchanges, a strategy chosen in order to represent the sequential function of the particles in full.

# CHAPTER 4

## THE PARTICLES IN AN UNMARKED TALK-IN-INTERACTION TYPE

### 4.1 Introduction

In Chapter Two, we proposed an original hypothesis to explain the functions of the particles *zero*, *ne*, *yo* and *yone* (the PFH), as in Table 1 on p.30.

In this chapter and in the following chapter, we will examine the extent to which the PFH accounts for the use of the particles in naturally occurring talk-in-interaction. Specifically, we will examine the particles in two different types of talk-in-interaction.

Firstly, in this chapter, we will examine an instance of ‘small talk’ involving two female native Japanese speakers, and in the next chapter we will examine a radio phone-in exchange involving a caller and a host. In this study, we will regard the former as ‘unmarked’ talk and the latter as ‘marked’, for the reason that in that in the former the communicative goals, in so far as they exist, are intrinsic in the sense that they are produced during the talk, whereas in the latter they are extrinsic in that they pre-exist the talk-in-interaction. We will therefore examine how the participants use the particles not only in an unmarked but also in a marked variety of talk-in-interaction so as to test the PFH in both incipient (interactional) talk and in goal-directed (transactional) talk.

## 4.2 The particles in everyday types talk

### 4.2.1 Data

As already discussed in 3.4.2.3, the data analysed in this chapter are a six-minute extract from a fifty-minute exchange between two female Japanese native speakers who were asked to record a casual conversation. At the time of the recording, neither of the speakers was aware of the researcher's area of investigation. The conversation occurred when Miki (hereafter M) visited Etsuko (hereafter E) in her student study-bedroom.<sup>1</sup> The part of the talk-in-interaction used in the following examination occurred five minutes after the start of the recording. Although the six-minute exchange appears to be a short extract, as will be seen, the particles *zero*, *ne*, *yo* and *yone* occur so frequently in talk-in-interaction between Japanese native speakers that an exchange of this length is fully sufficient to test the PFH.

As mentioned above, the talk-in-interaction data studied in this chapter are unmarked in the sense that the speakers' communicative goals arise intrinsically. Thus the ways the participants use the particles and the ways they respond to the utterances in which the particles occur are relatively unconstrained by any goal extrinsic to the natural direction of the talk exchange. If, therefore, the PFH does not hold in this talk-type, there is little point in testing it in a marked encounter of the kind that will be discussed in the next chapter.

---

<sup>1</sup> The names of the participants are disguised.

### 4.2.2 Analysis

In this, the main section of the chapter, we will test the validity of the PFH with five extracts drawn from the talk-in-interaction data mentioned above. Although naturally occurring talk data are far from being simple, it will be demonstrated that all the uses of the particles in the five extracts can be reconciled with the claims of the PFH. The first three extracts deal with the particles when they occur utterance-finally. Although the fourth extract also deals with the particles in utterance final position, it will be used to illustrate how the particles commonly occur when one participant tells the other a story. The last extract will deal with two other distributional uses of *ne*, utterance-internal *ne* and utterance-independent *ne*.

In each extract, we will first present a synopsis of the exchange and then identify the characteristic features of the use of the particles.

#### 4.2.2.1 Extract 1 - Particles occurring utterance-finally (1)

##### *Synopsis: content*

E and M talk about the husband of the Korean family from whom M rents a room: M tells E that he is very good person. E then tells M that she had the same impression of him when she talked to him on the telephone.

##### *Synopsis: particle use*

In this exchange, the particles *zero*, *yo* and *yone* occur, and all occurrences can be predicted by the PFH.



## Data

(From line 91 to line 104 in Appendix A)

- 1E: = sakki deta no dare ø? danna ø?  
just-before picked-up-the-phone person who husband
- 2 (0.8)
- 3M: a so so so [dannasan ø.]  
oh so so so husband
- 4E: [hee:. ]  
really
- 5M: un sugoi danna wa ii hito yo:. (0.8) nanka (1.0) un (1.0)  
yeah very husband Top good person yo something yes
- 6M: nanka yasashi soo da shi odayaka  
something kind seem Cop because calm
- 7M: da sh[i,]  
Cop because
- 8E: [un] so- soo da yo:ne:.  
yeah so Cop yone
- 9M: u::n. =  
yeah
- 10E: = na- nanka denwa no kanji demo  
something telephone LK impression also
- 11E: soo dat[ta ø.]  
so was
- 12M: [so ]o yaro ø.  
so Tag
- 13M: u:n soo na n yo. kare wa sugoi nanka yosasoo na hito ø.  
yeah so Cop Nom yo he Top very something seems-good Cop person
- 14E: u::n.  
yeah

(gloss)

- 1E: = Who was it who picked up the phone just before ø? The husband ø?
- 2 (0.8)
- 3M: Oh, yeah, that's the husband ø.
- 4E: Really:.
- 5M: Yeah he is a very nice person yo. (0.8) Er (1.0) Yeah. (1.0)
- 6/7M: Er cos he seems kind and gentle and,
- 8E: Yeah, that's right yone.
- 9M: Yea:h=
- 10/11E: = Er I felt the same when I talked to him on the phone ø.
- 12/13M: He is, isn't he ø? Yea:h he is so yo. He seems very nice ø.
- 14E: Yea:h.

## *Analysis*

E asks M who it was that she, E, had talked to earlier on the phone:

1E: = sakki            deta                            no        dare ø? danna ø?  
              just-before picked-up-the-phone person who        husband  
2        (0.8)  
1E: = Who was it who picked up the phone just before ø? The husband ø?  
2        (0.8)

In the second part of her turn, she presents M with the likely answer, asking whether or not it was the husband of the Korean family from whom M rents her room. Both utterances are marked with *zero*. This is because, as the first pair-part in an adjacency pair the utterance type, a question (the first is a *wh*-question and the latter is a *yes/no* question), directs an answer in the next turn. A 0.8 second pause follows, perhaps allowing processing time for M to understand E's (unexpected) question. M then confirms E's suggested answer, with a *zero* utterance, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded:

3M: a so so so [dannasan ø.]  
      oh so so so husband  
3M: Oh, yeah, that's the husband ø.

This is because she treats the proposition as no more than an answer to the question and expects no particular response to it.

E's acknowledgement in line 4 overlaps M's confirmation and M then adds that the husband is a very good person, with a *yo*-utterance:

3M: a so so so [dannasan ø.]  
      oh so so so husband  
4E:                            [hee:.        ]  
                              really

5M: un sugoi danna wa ii hito **yo:**..(0.8) nanka (1.0) un (1.0)  
 yeah very husband Top good person yo something yes

3M: Oh, yeah, that's the husband **o**.

4E: Really:.

5M: Yeah he is a very nice person **yo**. (0.8) er (1.0) yeah. (1.0)

This is because she intends the assertion, which E may not associate herself with yet, to be grounded and also directs an assumptive response. A 0.8-second pause follows, perhaps allowing time for herself (i.e. M) to search for or decide how to express the appropriate assumptive proposition.

This is then followed by *nanka* (something). *Nanka* is frequently used in Japanese talk with the same sort of presupposition triggering effect as pseudo-clefts in English: it indicates that there is something in the speaker's mind, and that he is going to say it next. Here it is clearly used as flow holding device while M determines just how to say what she wants to say about her landlord. Finally, M produces the assumptive response, saying that he seems kind and calm (line 6). E, overlapping the end of M's utterance, shows her agreement in line 8:

6M: nanka yasashi soo da shi odayaka  
 something kind seem Cop because calm

7M: da sh[i,]  
 Cop because

8E: [un] so- soo da **yo:ne:**..  
 yeah so Cop yone

6 / 7M: Er cos he seems kind and gentle and,

8E: Yeah, that's right **yone**.

At this point, she uses *yone*, proposing that the assertion emerging in the talk satisfies the criterion for having *yo* attached to it, and directing her acceptance of this, an acceptance which M then provides:

9M: u::n. =  
 yeah

9M: Yea::h=

In a latched response, E then reacts to the implied force of *yo* in her own *yone*-utterance in line 8, saying that she had the same impression of the Korean husband when she talked to him on the phone:

10E: = na- nanka denwa no kanji demo  
something telephone LK impression also

11E: soo dat[ta 0.]  
so was

10/11E: = Er I felt the same when I talked to him on the phone 0.

She marks this utterance with *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded: she expects no particular response to it from M in the next turn. It seems that at this point she regards this utterance as topic closing.

In considering the exchanges from lines 5-11 as a whole, it can be said that the phrase *soo da yone* (That's right *yone*) in line 8 is used by E to extend the topic about which M has talked in the previous utterances (lines 5-7). (See p.57 for discussion of the phrase *soo da/desu yone*).

Overlapping the end of E's utterance in line 11, M shows her agreement in line 12:

10E: = na- nanka denwa no kanji demo  
something telephone LK impression also

11E: soo dat[ta 0.]  
so was

12M: [so ]o yaro 0.  
so Tag

10/11E: = Er I felt the same when I talked to him on the phone 0.  
12M: He is, isn't he 0?.

At this point, she uses *zero* because she adds the tag like expression *yaro* to the end of the utterance: no response is necessarily required in the next turn and if there is a response, it will be an agreement.

M then continues: her *u:n* (Yea:h) follows, perhaps allowing time for her to decide what she will say next.

13M: *u:n* soo na n **yo**. kare wa sugoi nanka yosasoo na hito ø.  
yeah so Cop Nom yo he Top very something seems-good Cop person

13M: Yea:h he is so **yo**. He seems very nice ø.

Following *u:n* (Yea:h), she shows her agreement again, perhaps to gain time. At this point, she uses *yo*, intending the agreement to be grounded in the expectation that E may not fully associate herself with the assertion yet, and also directing an assumptive response. Reacting to the force of *yo* in her own utterance, she tells E that the husband seems very nice, with a *zero* utterance giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded. This is because she expects no particular response from E next.

M's *zero*-utterance is followed by E's agreement *u::n* (Yea::h):

14E: *u::n*.  
yeah

14E: Yea::h.

She does not say anything more, probably because she also does not have anything to say on this topic, which is exhausted having gone round a cycle from *nice* (line 5) to *kind/gentle* (line 6) to *nice* again (line 13) with movement from general to particular constituting a topic development move, and movement from particular to general constituting a topic closing move.

#### 4.2.2.2 Extract 2 - Particles occurring utterance-finally (2)

##### *Synopsis: content*

E and M talk about one of the children of the Korean family from whom M rents her room and who studies music in Vienna. From this fact, E and M conclude that the family is well-off. Then the topic develops as they move on to a discussion of the wealth required if children are to study music in a foreign country.

##### *Synopsis: particle use*

In this exchange, all the particles *zero*, *ne*, *yo* and *yone* occur, and all the occurrences are readily predicted by the PFH.

##### *Data*

In the talk leading up to this episode, M tells E that one of the children of the Korean family from whom M rents a room is studying music in Vienna.

(From line 168 to line 183 in Appendix A)

- 1E: e:: [ja, ]  
wow then
- 2M: [aaiu] no tte juunen toka iku n da tte 0. =  
that-kind-of one Top ten-years or-something go Nom Cop QT
- 3E: = a ja moo are kana: ja- chuugaku kookoo gurai  
oh then Int that I-wonder then junior-high-school high-school about
- 4E: kara moo yatteiru no ka 0.  
from already is-doing Nom Q
- 5M: juu::[:dai kara haitteiru] to omoo 0. un juudai kara  
teenager from enter Comp think yes teenager from
- 6E: [( )]
- 7M: haitteiru n da to omoo 0. de juu- dakara kookoo  
enter Nom Cop Comp think and ten therefore high-school
- 8M: sotsugyooshita [ato janai tabun 0.]  
graduated after Tag probably



9E: [ja: kanemochi da] ne:.  
then rich Cop ne

10M: kanemochi da yo:.. =  
rich Cop yo

11E: = .hh datte sa nihonjin demo tamani hora  
because IP Japanese-people also occasionally you-know

12E: ondaisei de ryuugakusuru hito iru kedo sa: (1.0)  
music-university-student and study-abroad person exist but IP

13E: okane nai to ne: (.) ika- ikaserarenai yo:.. =  
money don't-have if ne can't-let- (someone)-go yo

14M: = soo da [yone. nanzenman tte kakaru janai ø? u:~n]  
so Cop yone ten-millions as-much-as cost Tag uh-huh

15E: [u:~n datte sagishira yuuko tte]iu sa:  
yeah because Sagishira Yuuko called IP

16E: yuumei na hora sopurano shinga:~ shitteru ø?  
famous Cop er soprano singer know

(gloss)

1E: Wow:: if so,  
2M: I heard it takes about ten years to graduate from that kind of school ø. =  
3/4E: = Oh then did she start the course from junior high school or high school age ø?  
5-8M: I think she entered the school when she was a tee::::nager ø. Yes. I think she entered the school  
when she was a teenager ø. And so probably after she graduated from high school, isn't it ø?  
9E: Then they are rich ne:.  
10M: They are rich yo:.. =  
11-13E: = .hh Because some Japanese music students sometimes study abroad and (1.0) if their parents don't  
have money ne, they can't afford to send them yo:.. =  
14M: = That's right yone. It costs millions of yen, doesn't it ø? Uh-huh.  
15/16E: Yea:~h do you know a famous soprano singer called Yuuko Shirasagi ø?

## Analysis

Having been told immediately before this exchange that one of the children of the Korean family from whom M rents a room is a music student in Vienna, E now shows her surprise, and begins a broken-off turn with 'if so...', which projects an assumptive continuation:

1E: e:~ [ja, ]  
wow then

1E: Wow:: if so,

However, E's utterance overlaps the start of M's turn in which M says that she heard that it usually takes about ten years to graduate from a music school:

2M: [aaiu] no tte juunen toka iku n da tte 0. =  
that-kind-of one Top ten-years or-something go Nom Cop QT

2M: I heard it takes about ten years to graduate from that kind of school 0. =

At this point, she uses *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded: she expects no particular response to it from E in the next turn. We can also argue that she uses *zero* presumably since she is relating information which is not personal to herself and about which she does not have a strong forcing intention.

In a latched utterance, E asks M if the child started her study of music in junior high school or in high school:

3E: = a ja moo are kana: ja- chuugaku kookoo gurai  
oh then Int that I-wonder then junior-high-school high-school about

4E: kara moo yatteiru no ka 0.  
from already is-doing Nom Q

3/4E: = Oh then did she start the course from junior high school or high school age 0?

At this point, she also uses *zero*. This is because, as the first pair-part in an adjacency pair, the utterance type, a question, directs an answer in the next turn.

Responding to E's question, M twice repeats that she thinks that the child entered the school when she was a teenager:

5M: juu::[:dai kara haitteiru] to omoo 0. un juudai kara  
teenager from enter Comp think yes teenager from

6E: [( )]

7M: haitteiru n da to omoo 0. de juu- dakara kookoo  
enter Nom Cop Comp think and ten therefore high-school

8M: sotsugyooshita [ato janai tabun 0.]  
graduated after Tag probably

5-8M: I think she entered the school when she was a tee:::nager 0. Yes. I think she entered the school when she was a teenager 0. And so probably after she graduated from high school, isn't it 0?

She marks both utterances with *zero*: it seems that they are directed partly to herself rather than E from the lengthened syllables in *juu:::dai* (tee:::nager) and the self-



confirmation *un* (yes). Then she tells E that the child probably entered the school after graduating from high school (lines 7 and 8). At this point, she uses *zero* again because of the tag-like expression *janai*. Overlapping the last three words of M's utterance in line 8, E starts her turn in line 9 by saying that the family is wealthy:

8M: sotsugyooshita [ato janai tabun ø.]  
 graduated after Tag probably

9E [ja: kanemochi da] **ne:**  
 then rich Cop ne

8M: And so probably after she graduated from high school, isn't it ø?  
 9E: Then they are rich **ne:**.

At this point, she uses *ne*, proposing that the assertion should be treated as a ground for the next proposition without further ado, and thus directs in M's acceptance.

10M: kanemochi da **yo::** =  
 rich Cop yo

10M: They are rich **yo::** =

Subsequently, M shows her acceptance, repeating the description contained in E's utterance (i.e. that the family is wealthy), and marking her utterance with *yo*. This is because she intends the figure emerging in the talk to be grounded in the expectation that E does not associate herself fully with the figure yet, and directs an assumptive response.

In a latched turn, E says that if the parents of students are not well-off, they cannot possibly afford to let the children go abroad to study music. It seems, however, that E does not say this because of the force of *yo* in M's utterances. Rather, the first word in line 11 *datte* (because) indicates that the proposition in lines 11-13 is an assumptive continuation of line 9 and in a sense justifies it as a contribution to the conversation:

9E: [ja: kanemochi da] **ne:**..  
       then rich Cop ne

10M: kanemochi da **yo:**.. =  
       rich Cop yo

11E: = .hh datte sa nihonjin demo tamani hora  
       because IP Japanese-people also occasionally er

12E: ondaisei de ryuugakusuru hito iru kedo sa: (1.0)  
       music-university-student and study-abroad person exist but IP

13E: okane nai to **ne:**..<sup>2</sup> (.) ika- ikaserarenai **yo:**.. =  
       money Neg if ne can't-let- (someone)-go yo

9E: Then they are rich **ne:**.  
 10M: They are rich **yo:**.. =  
 11-13E: = .hh Because some Japanese music students sometimes study abroad and (1.0) if their parents don't  
       have money ne, they can't afford to send them **yo:**.. =

E marks the utterance in line 11-13 with *yo* since she intends the figure emerging in the talk to be grounded in the expectation that figure may be either new or controversial to M, and also directs an assumptive response.

In a latched utterance, M shows her agreement, marking it with *yone*. Then, she continues with the new proposition, that studying music in a foreign country costs millions of yen:

14M: = soo da [**yone**. nanzenman tte kakaru janai ø? u:~n]  
       so Cop yone ten-millions as-much-as cost Tag uh-huh

14M: = That's right **yone**. It costs ten million yen, doesn't it ø? Uh-huh.

We hypothesized that *yone* is used when the speaker proposes that the figure emerging in the talk satisfies the criterion for having *yo* attached to it, and thus directs the addressee's acceptance of this property. However, the use of *yone* here is not problematical given that we also hypothesized that the speaker sometimes continues a *yone*-marked turn with an assumptive response of their own (p.29).

The reason why M uses the phrase 'That's right *yone*' here is interesting; we can

---

<sup>2</sup> Utterance-internal *ne* will be examined in Extract 5 of this chapter.

argue that M inserts the phrase ‘That’s right *yone*’ between E’s utterance marked with *yo* (lines 11-13) and her own assumptive response that it costs millions of yen in order to emphasise her agreement with what E has said in lines 11-13. To put it another way, by saying ‘That’s right *yone*’ before producing an assumptive response, M intends to indicate that the proposition in lines 11-13 is not exclusive to E but rather something everyone knows. M adds *yone* to ‘That’s right’ since *yo* is needed to relay the force of *yo* in E’s utterance in line 13 on to the next phrase of her own turn and *ne* is needed to encode that M proposes that ‘That’s right *yo*’ should be treated as a ground for the next proposition without further ado although the sequential force of *ne* is expectably empty in this case, since it would be otiose for E to accept the appropriacy of her own *yo* as relayed by M. After saying ‘That’s right *yone*’, M tells E that studying music abroad costs ten million Japanese yen, which constitutes an assumptive response to E’s *yo*-utterance in lines 11-13. At this point, she uses *zero* since the tag-like expression *janai* pre-empts the use of particles.

Overlapping M’s use of *yone* in line 14, E says ‘yeah’, which constitutes her orientation to M’s agreement ‘That’s right’ in line 14, and asks M if she knows a soprano singer called Yuuko Shirasagi:

- 14M: = soo da [yone. nanzenman tte kakaru janai ø?. u::n]  
           so Cop yone ten-millions as-much-as cost Tag uh-huh
- 15E:           [u::n datte sagishira yuuko tte]iu sa:  
               yeah because Sagishira Yuuko called IP
- 16E: yuumei na hora sopurano shinga:: shitteru ø?  
           famous Cop er soprano singer know
- 14M:       = That’s right *yone*. It costs millions of yen, doesn’t it ø? Uh-huh.  
 15/16E:    Yea::h do you know a famous soprano singer called Yuuko Shirasagi ø?

At this point, she uses *zero* since, as the first pair-part in an adjacency pair, the utterance type, a question, automatically requires M to provide a second pair-part in the form of

an answer. Thus her question is an assumptive continuation to her own *yo*-utterance in lines 13 in that, as will be revealed in the following turns, the singer in the questions has also studied music in a foreign country. That is to say, M and E both react the force of *yo* in E's utterance in line 13.

#### 4.2.2.3 Extract 3 - Particles occurring utterance-finally (3)

##### *Synopsis: content*

M tells E that when men reach their fifties, they can be divided into two categories: one category is those who become scruffy, and the other category is those who remain tidy. Then E starts what might be termed an "age auction" by suggesting that scruffy old men become dirty even before their fifties. At this point, M laughs and E goes further with the age auction, by saying that people can guess whether or not men will become scruffy old men when they are in their thirties. When M accepts this suggestion too, E goes a step further by saying that some men even become scruffy in their twenties. Having shown her agreement with E's utterance, M then says that scruffy old men are scruffy from the start.

##### *Synopsis: particle use*

In this exchange, the particles *zero*, *ne*, *yo* and *yone* all occur. All the occurrences except for one, an instance where M's *yone*-utterance is followed by a 0.8 second pause, are directly predicted by the PFH. This *yone*-utterance seems problematical since it is hypothesised in the PFH that *yone* generally directs the addressee's acceptance. Nonetheless, we will reconcile this instance with the PFH,

arguing that E has difficulty in conceiving what the assumptive response would be since M adds an afterthought to her *yone*-utterance.

### **Data**

E and M talk about the age at which men become scruffy. In the talk leading up to the following episode, M tells E that M's landlord is not a scruffy old man, which leads E to wonder if M had had bad experiences with scruffy old men. Having denied this speculation, M continues her narrative:

(From line 118 to line 148 in Appendix A)

1M: ie ie ie ie datte hora (.) nanka  
no no no no because er something

2M: koo wakareru **yone**: yappa  
er branch-off yone expectedly

3M: gojuudai gurai ni naru to sa: otoko no hito tte.  
fifties around to become when IP men LK person Top

4 (0.8)

5M: sugoi kitanai rosen ni iku ka,  
very dirty route to go Q

6E: huh (laughter)

7M: kirei na kirei na [( )]  
clean Cop clean Cop

8E: [demo] kitanai hito tte gojuu ni  
but dirty person Top fifties to

9E: ikanaku temo kitanai deshoo ø?  
doesn't-reach even dirty Tag

10M: hah hah hah [hah]

11E: [moo] sanjuu gurai kara moo su[deni, ]  
already thirties around from Int already

12M: [hah hah] hah

13M: [soo kamoshinnai ø.]  
so might

14E: [moo::: ] yosootsuku **yo.** =  
Intensifier can-guess yo

15M: = hah are wa:: hah hah hah  
that Top

16M: yosootsuku **ne**:: =  
can-guess ne

17E: = u:[n.]  
yeah

18M: [ta]shikani **ø**.  
surely

19 (1.0)

20M: u:[n.]  
yeah

21E: [ni]juudai no wakai yatsu wa ne:: ano:  
twenties LK young men Top ne er

22E: wakai hito demo i:- soo naru yatsu wa iru **ne**.  
young person even so become men Top exist ne

23M: soo **ne**::  
so ne

24E: un.  
yeah

25M: kitanai hito wa motomoto kitanai kara **ø**.  
dirty person Top originally scruffy because

26 (1.0)

27M: wakannai kedo **ø**.  
don't-know though

28 (.)

29M: sorede maa:: un (.) maa sugoi ii hito na no ne. (.)  
then er yes er very good person Cop Nom ne

30M: .hh dakara zenzen itemo  
therefore at-all even-when-exist

31M: a: iru no tte kanji de,  
oh exist Nom QT impression and

(gloss)

1-3M: Er (men) are divided into two types **yone**: typically when men reach their fifties.  
4 (0.8)

5M: Whether they follow the very scruffy route or,  
6E: (laughter)  
7M: remain tidy ( )

8/9E: But a person who's going to be scruffy is scruffy even before his fifties, isn't he **ø**?  
10M: (laughter)

11E: Already in their thirties,  
12/13M: (laughter) You are probably right **ø**.  
14E: really::: you can guess **yo**. =

15/16M: = (laughter) Tha::t's (laughter) something you can guess **ne::**. =  
 17E: = Yea:h.  
 18M: Surely **ø**.  
 19 (1.0)  
 20M: Yea:h.  
 21/22E: Young people in twenties **ne::** er:: there are even some young who become so **ne**.  
 23M: That's right **ne::**.  
 24E: Yeah.  
 25M: Because scruffy people are scruffy from the beginning **ø**.  
 26 (1.0)  
 27M: I don't know though **ø**.  
 28 (.)  
 29-31M: And then er:: yeah (.) he is a really great person no **ne**. (.) .hh so when he is with us,  
 it's like 'Oh you are here?' and,

## Analysis

This episode starts with M's saying that men can be divided into two categories when they reach their fifties:

1M: ie ie ie ie datte hora (.) nanka  
 no no no no because er something  
 2M: koo wakareru **yone**: yappa  
 er branch-off yone expectedly  
 3M: gojuudai guraini naru to sa: otoko no hito tte.  
 fifties around become when IP men LK person Top  
 4 (0.8)  
 1-3M: Er (men) are divided into two types **yone**: typically when men reach their fifties.  
 4 (0.8)

At this point, M uses *yone* since she proposes that the figure emerging in the talk satisfies the criterion for having *yo* attached to it and directs her acceptance of this. What may be problematical here for E is that the subordinate *gojuudai gurai ni naru to* (when men reach their fifties) is placed after the predicate *wakareru yone* (men are divided into two types *yone*) although subordinate clauses precede main clauses in the usual way in Japanese. As an explanation, we might hypothesize that the utterance as a whole exhibits slip-of-tongue properties and that the predicate appears before the

subordinate since it is cognitively more salient to M. M's utterance is followed by a 0.8 second pause rather than E's acceptance or the assumptive response that M was probably expecting. This pause indicates that M intends E to produce an assumptive response. However, E does not say anything, probably because M's afterthought in lines 2-3 makes it difficult for her to conceive what the assumptive response would be. Then, M starts clarifying what she meant, by saying that men will either become very scruffy or stay clean:

5M: sugoi kitanai rosen ni iku ka,  
very dirty route to go Q

6E: huh (laughter)

7M: kirei na kirei na [( )]  
clean Cop clean Cop

5M: Whether they follow the very scruffy route or,

6E: (laughter)

7M: remain tidy ( )

Interrupting M, E starts an age auction suggesting to M that scruffy old men become scruffy even before their fifties:

7M: kirei na kirei na [( )]  
clean Cop clean Cop

8E: [demo] kitanai hito tte gojuu ni  
but dirty person Top fifties to

9E: ikanaku temo kitanai deshoo ø?  
doesn't-reach even dirty Tag

10M: hah hah hah [hah]

7M: remain tidy ( )

8/9E: But a person who's going to be scruffy is scruffy even before his fifties, isn't he ø?

10M: (laughter)

E uses *zero* since the tag-like expression *deshoo* pre-empts the use of particles. At this point M laughs to indicate that what E has said in the previous utterance is rather unexpected. E then goes further with the age auction by starting to say that men are



scruffy even in their thirties:

11E: [moo] sanjuu gurai kara moo su[deni, ]  
already thirties around from Int already

12M: [hah hah ] hah

13M: [soo kamoshinnai ø.]  
so might

11E: Already in their thirties,  
12/13M: (laughter) You are probably right ø.

However M interrupts E's utterance with laughter which suggests that what E has said is unexpected although she agrees, probably out of politeness: her agreement is rather tentative, however, as the auxiliary verb *kamoshinnai* indicates. At this point she uses *zero* since E is in mid-turn and it would be inappropriate to direct a response to her agreement with E. E then completes her utterance, saying that people can guess:

14E: [moo::: ] yosootsuku yo.=  
Intensifier can-guess yo

14E: really::: you can guess yo.=

At this point, E uses *yo*, intending the figure emerging in the talk in lines 11 and 14 (i.e. when men reach their thirties, you can guess whether they become scruffy or they remain tidy) to be grounded and also directing an assumptive response.

In a latched response, M laughs (*hah*), indicating that the proposition contained in E's utterance is unexpected. Then, reacting to the force of *yo* in E's utterance, M shows her agreement:

15M: = hah are wa:: hah hah hah  
that Top

16 yosootsuku ne::. =  
can-guess ne

15/16M: = (laughter) Tha::t's (laughter) something you can guess ne::. =

The lengthened syllable in the topic marker *wa::* [represented as ‘Tha::t’s’ in the free gloss] allows M sufficient processing time to decide what an appropriate assumptive response would be. Then she laughs again and produces a less than smart assumptive response, repeating what E has said in line 14 ‘something you can guess’. This implies that M cannot think of a clever response to E’s *yo*-utterance in line 14. M marks this agreement with *ne*, proposing that her agreement should be treated as a ground for the next proposition without further ado, and directing E’s acceptance of it. That is to say, M passes the proposition which she cannot handle back to E.

Reacting to the force of *ne*, E shows her acceptance with ‘Yeah’.

17E: = u: [n.]  
yeah

18M: [ta]shikani ø.  
surely

19 (1.0)

20M: u: [n.]  
yeah

17E: = Yea:h.  
18M: Surely ø.  
19 (1.0)  
20M: Yea:h.

Overlapping the end of E’s confirmation, M again shows her agreement with ‘Surely’. This is followed by a one-second pause which in turn is followed by M’s *u:n* (Yea:h). It seems that the topic is exhausted at this point.

However, overlapping the end of M’s ‘Yeah’, E restarts the age auction by saying that some men even become scruffy old men in their twenties, and at this point she uses *ne*. This is because she proposes that the proposition contained in the talk should be treated as a ground for the next proposition without further ado, and directs M’s acceptance of this:

21E: [ni]juudai no wakai yatsu wa ne::<sup>3</sup> ano:  
twenties LK young men Top ne er

22E: wakai hito demo i:- soo naru yatsu wa iru **ne**.  
young person even so become men Top exist ne

21/22E: Young people in twenties ne:: er:: there are even some young who become so **ne**.

Being obliged to react to the force of *ne*, M shows her acceptance:

23M: soo **ne**:.  
so ne

23M: That's right **ne**:

At this point, she obligatorily uses *ne* in return, proposing that the figure emerging in the talk (signalled as acceptance) should be treated as a ground for the next proposition without further ado and also directing E's acceptance (see p.36) which she, E, provides:

24E: un.  
yeah

24E: Yeah.

M finally joins the age auction herself, by saying that scruffy old men are scruffy from the start. At this point, she uses *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded:

25M: kitanai hito wa motomoto kitanai kara **ø**.  
dirty person Top originally scruffy because

25M: Because scruffy people are scruffy from the beginning **ø**.

It seems that she does not intend to continue the topic since the age auction can go no further. A one-second pause follows M's *zero*-utterance.

26 (1.0)

---

<sup>3</sup> Utterance-internal *ne* will be examined in Extract 5 of this chapter.

Then M says ‘I don’t know though’ perhaps suggesting that the age auction has gone too far after all:

27M: wakannai kedo 0.  
don’t-know though

27M: I don’t know though 0.

At this point, M uses *zero* to show that she has no further interest in maintaining the topic. This argument can be strengthened by the fact that she moves to a different topic after a micro pause, as shown below.

28 (.)

29M: sorede maa:: un (.) maa sugoi ii hito na no ne.<sup>4</sup> (.)  
then er yes er very good person Cop Nom ne

30M: .hh dakara zenzen itemo  
therefore at-all even-when-exist

31M: a: iru no tte kanji de,  
oh exist Nom QT impression and

28 (.)

29-31M: And then er:: yeah (.) he is a really great person no ne. (.) .hh so when he is with us,  
it’s like ‘Oh you are here?’ and,

#### 4.2.2.4 Extract 4 - Particles attached to nominalized structures

##### *Synopsis*

In this part of the exchange, E is giving an account of what had happened to her the previous night. The story goes as follows: somebody knocked at E’s door after midnight and although she asked the person to give their name, the person replied only, ‘Me’. Having no choice, E opened the door, only to be told by the person who had been

knocking, a Korean man who had lent E a screwdriver, that she was rude because she had not returned the screwdriver sooner.

***Synopsis: particle use***

In this exchange, we will examine *ne* and *yo* as they appear with nominalized structures. Nominalized structures are often used in Japanese talk-in-interaction in contexts where we would expect a finite sentence in English. Although there are a number of competing theories (Noda, 1997; Saji, 1991; Tanomura, 1990, etc.), it seems that their function is to make the proposition contained in the nominalized utterance less assertive, i.e. to lessen the subjectivity of the account given by the speaker and hence lend it an air of objectivity. In other words, by using a nominalized structure, a speaker shares the propositional content of his utterance with an addressee, rather than treating it as something exclusive to himself as a speaker. This function is typically associated with recounting an incident such as the one recounted here, since when a speaker tells a story in Japanese, he typically presents it objectively in nominal rather than verbal form as a series of facts rather than a set of assertions.

In the talk data, both the particles *ne* and *yo* are repeatedly attached to such nominalized structures; by marking nominalized structures with either *ne* or *yo*, the speaker directs the addressee's acceptance of the proposition contained in the structures as a ground for the next proposition in the sequence. However, as the data below show, the speaker tends to employ *ne* to mark a nominalized structure containing a proposition which is relatively predictable or expectable, whereas he tends to employ *yo* to mark a nominalized structure in which the proposition is less expectable, and even sometimes

---

<sup>4</sup> *Ne* attached to nominalized structures will be examined in the next extract.

rather surprising or even dramatic. Thus agreeing with a nominalized structure with *yo* (rather than producing an inferentially related proposition) may be considered assumptive.

## **Data**

(From line 1 to line 26 in Appendix A)

1E: machiko ga iru tokini, =  
Machiko S exist when

2M: = u[n.]  
uh-huh

3E: [to]nton tte (.) tataku **wake yo.**  
knock-knock QT knock Nom yo

4M: UN. =  
uh-huh

5E: = de watashi moo mayonaka da shi ne  
and I already midnight Cop because ne

6E: ichiji sugi da shi,=  
one-oclock past Cop because

7M: = UN. =  
uh-huh

8E: = de kowai kara sa (.) who are you toka tte,  
and scared because IP who are you or-something QT

9M: huh huh huh huh huh [huh]

10E: [who] is it toka tte itta **no ka na:** watashi.  
who is it or-something QT said Nom Q na I

11E: .hh de sa nanka (.) tsu- me toka tte iu **no ne:.** =  
and IP something me or-something QT say Nom ne

12M: = un.  
uh-huh

13E: .hh mii ja: wakannai [jan ø.]  
me with-Top don't-know Tag

14M: [huh ] huh huh huh huh [huh] huh huh huh

15E: [de,]  
and

16E: so say your name toka tte it[tara] sa:,  
so say your name or-something QT when-said IP

17M: [-(un)]  
uh-huh

18E .hh nanka iwanai saigo made iwanai **no yo.**  
 something doesn't-say last until doesn't-say Nom yo

19M: un.  
 uh-huh

20E: de shooganai kara aketa **no ne.**  
 and no-choice because opened Nom ne

21E: so shitara ikinari ne, a- nante itta to omoo ø?  
 so when-did suddenly ne what said Comp think

22E: you are so rude tte iu **no yo.**  
 you are so rude QT say Nom yo

23M: huh huh huh

24E: na- nande tte,  
 why QT

25M: un un un.  
 yeah yeah yeah

26 (0.5)

(gloss)

1E: When Machiko was here (in E's room), =  
 2M: = Uh-huh.  
 3E: somebody knocked on my door **wake yo.**  
 4M: UH-HUH. =  
 5/6E: = because it was midnight ne and because it was after one o'clock, =  
 7M: = UH-HUH. =  
 8-10E: = and because I was scared, I said 'who are you?' 'who is it?' or something **no ka na:**  
 11E: .hh And er (.) this person said 'Me' or something **no ne.** =  
 12M: = Uh-huh.  
 13E: .hh And I don't know who it is, right ø?  
 14M: (laughter)  
 15/16E: And I said 'So say your name' and,  
 17M: Uh-huh.  
 18E: .hh this person did not saying anything more **no yo.**  
 19M: Uh-huh.  
 20E: And because I didn't have a choice, I opened the door **no ne.**  
 21E: And out of the blue ne, what do you think he said ø?  
 22E: The person said 'you are rude' **no yo.**  
 23M: (laughter)  
 24E: Like, 'why?',  
 25M: Yeah yeah yeah.  
 26 (0.5)

### *Analysis*

E's storytelling starts with her saying that when their mutual friend Machiko was in E's room, there was a knock at her door:

1E: machiko ga iru tokini, =  
Machiko S exist when

2M: = u{n.}  
uh-huh

3E: [to]nton tte (.) tataku **wake yo.**  
knock-knock QT knock Nom yo

1E: When Machiko was here (in E's room), =

2M: = Uh-huh.

3E: somebody knocked on my door **wake yo.**

This utterance is nominalized because she intends the proposition contained in the talk to be the first phrase of the account she is providing. E also marks this nominal structure with *yo*, directing M's acceptance of the somewhat unexpected proposition (as mentioned in the synopsis, somebody knocked at E's door) as a ground for the next proposition in the sequence.

Reacting to the force of *yo*, M provides a high-toned verbal acceptance 'UH-HUH', which indicates her interest in what E has said and marks the first phrase of the account as indeed a surprising ground for what may follow:

4M: UN. =  
uh-huh

4M: UH-HUH. =

E then resumes the story, saying that she asked the person to say their name since she was scared at one o'clock in the morning (although as noted above she was in fact entertaining her friend Machiko):

5E: = de watashi moo mayonaka da shi ne<sup>5</sup>  
and I already midnight Cop because ne

6E: ichiji sugi da shi, =  
one-oclock past Cop because

7M: = UN. =  
uh-huh

---

<sup>5</sup> Utterance-internal *ne* will be examined in the next extract.



8E: = de kowai kara sa (.) who are you toka tte,  
and scared because IP who are you or-something QT

9M: huh huh huh huh huh [huh]

10E: [who] is it toka tte itta **no ka na:** watashi.  
who is it or-something QT said Nom Q IP I

5/6E: = because it was midnight ne and because it was after one o'clock, =

7M: = UH-HUH. =

8-10E: = and because I was scared, I said 'who are you?' 'who is it?' or something **no ka na:**.

11E: .hh And er (.) this person said 'Me' or something **no ne.** =

This first part of the resumed account is nominalized. At this point, she uses *kana* a combination of two particles, the question particle *ka* and an interactional particle *na*. *Na* has a similar function to *ne*, but is normally restricted to contexts where the speaker is also the illocutionary target of their own utterance. Therefore, it can be said that *kana* can be used when the speaker muses aloud, as happens here where E continues to hold the floor, saying that the person answered 'Me' or something:

11E: .hh de sa nanka (.) tsu- me toka tte iu **no ne:** =  
and IP something me or-something QT say Nom ne

11E: .hh And er (.) this person said 'Me' or something **no ne:** =

Again, this is nominalized. At this point, she uses *ne*, directing M's acceptance of the proposition as a ground for the next proposition in the sequence. M duly obliges with a latched *aizuchi*:

12M: = un.  
uh-huh

12M: = Uh-huh.

E continues the story, saying that she could not know who the person was on the basis of 'Me', a turn marked with a tag-like expression *jan* (line 13):

13E: .hh mii ja: wakannai [jan ø.]  
 me with-Top don't-know Tag

14M: [huh ] huh huh huh huh [huh] huh huh huh

13E: .hh And I don't know who it is, right ø?

14M: (laughter)

Interestingly she does not nominalize this utterance. This is because the utterance is not a part of the story but rather her own comment on the story. At this point, she uses *zero* because she uses the tag-like expression at the end of the utterance, which is responded to by M's laughter in line 14.

Overlapping M's laughter, E continues her story, saying that when she asked the person to say their name again, the person did not say anything more. This is again nominalized:

15E: [de,]  
 and

16E: so say your name toka tte it[tara] sa:,  
 so say your name or-something QT when-said IP

17M: [(un)]  
 uh-huh

18E: .hh nanka iwanai saigo made iwanai **no yo**.  
 something doesn't-say last until doesn't-say Nom yo

19M: un.  
 uh-huh

15/16E: And I said 'So say your name' and,

17M: Uh-huh.

18E: .hh this person did not saying anything more **no yo**.

19M: Uh-huh.

At this point, she uses *yo*, directing M's acceptance of the somewhat surprising proposition contained in the structures being treated as a ground for the next proposition in the sequence. M's acceptance follows; no 'clever' assumptive response from her is required because the nominalizer marks 18E is part of the continuing account.

E resumes the story, saying that she had no choice but to open the door. This is

again nominalized:

20E: de shooganai kara aketa **no ne**.  
and no-choice because opened Nom ne

20E: And because I didn't have a choice, I opened the door **no ne**.

At this point, she uses *ne*, directing M's acceptance of the proposition contained in the structure being treated as a ground for the next proposition in the sequence. Although M's acceptance cannot be seen in the transcription, it is likely that M's *aizuchi* was non-verbal. Alternatively, we might argue that M did not produce her confirmation since it was obvious that E would continue the story even without it. And indeed, E does continue the story, asking M to guess what the person said to her when she opened the door:

21E: so shitara ikinari ne<sup>6</sup>, a- nante itta to omoo **ø**?  
so when-did suddenly ne what said Comp think

21E: And out of the blue ne what do you think he said **ø**?

At this point, E uses *zero*. This is because the utterance type, a question, directs an answer in the next turn. This question is intended to heighten M's interest rather than to produce a response. Without giving M time to respond to her open question, E answers her own question directly, saying that the man accused her of being rude, which is again nominalized.

22E: you are so rude tte iu **no yo**.  
you are so rude QT say Nom yo

22E: The person said 'you are rude' **no yo**.

At this point, E uses *yo*, directing M's acceptance of the astonishing and unexpected proposition contained in the structure being treated as a ground for the next proposition.

---

<sup>6</sup> Utterance-internal *ne* will be examined in the next extract.

in the sequence. M's laughter, which can be considered as her acceptance of it, follows:

23M: huh huh huh

23M: (laughter)

Then, E says, 'Like, "Why?"', which is followed by M's agreement:

24E: na- nande tte,  
          why QT

25M: un un un.  
      yeah yeah yeah

24E: Like, 'Why?',

25M: Yeah yeah yeah.

A 0.5 second pause occurs:

26 (0.5)

How the exchange develops after the pause will be examined in the next extract.

#### **4.2.2.5 Extract 5 – Utterance internal and utterance-independent *ne***

In this exchange, we will consider *ne* when it occurs not utterance-finally but utterance-internally and utterance-independently.

##### ***Synopsis: content***

The episode analysed in this sub-section immediately follows the account analysed above. In this episode, E tells M that she cannot believe that the Korean man who had lent her a screwdriver told her that she was rude only because she had not returned it sooner. She also justifies her reaction to his refusing to give his name.

### *Synopsis: particle use*

This exchange focuses on two uses of *ne*, *ne* occurring utterance-internally and *ne* occurring utterance-independently. In Chapter Two, it was hypothesised that utterance-internal *ne* is used to mark not whole utterances but information units within utterances: by using utterance-internal *ne*, the speaker proposes that the information units should be treated as a ground for one or more upcoming information unit(s) without further ado, and also directs the addressee's acceptance of the role of the information unit in helping to build the account. Also, it was hypothesised that utterance-independent *ne* is used when the speaker proposes that all of what has been said so far about the topic in the preceding sequence of utterances should be treated as a ground for the upcoming utterances by the addressee.

### *Data*

In the talk leading up to the following episode, the Korean man comes to E's room after one o'clock in the morning and tells her that she is rude since she has not returned his screwdriver sooner.

(From line 27 to line 38 in Appendix A)

1E: konna **ne**:,  
this ne

2M: heh

3E: kogitanai **ne**:,  
crummy ne

4M: huh [huh huh huh ]

5E: [doraibaa ] o kaesanai dake de **ne** ::  
screwdriver O don't-return only because ne

6E: nande atashi ga rude na no [sa: ] tte,  
why I S rude Cop Nom IP QT

7M: [u:n.]  
right

8E: .hh atashi wa koko ni hitoride ite kowai no yo tte,  
I Top here at by-myself exist scared Nom yo QT

9M: huh huh huh huh =

10E: = **ne**. (.) namae o kakuninsuru no wa toozen deshoo ø?  
ne name O identify Nom Top natural Tag

11M: un.  
yeah

12E: tte yutte heh heh heh heh heh sugoi nanka okotten no ø.  
QT said very something angry Nom

(gloss)

1-6E: I told him why I am rude only because I have not returned this **ne**: crummy **ne**: screwdriver and,  
7M: Right.  
8E: .hh I told him 'I'm scared here by myself yo'.  
9M: (laughter) =  
10E: = **Ne**. (.) It's natural to ask who it is, isn't it?,  
11M: Yeah.  
12E: I said it to him, and (laughter) he was really angry ø.

## *Analysis*

The episode starts with E showing her anger by saying that she had asked him whether she was rude only because she had not returned his crummy screwdriver earlier (lines 1, 3, 5 and 6):

1E: konna **ne**:,  
this ne

2M: heh

3E: kogitanai **ne**:,  
crummy ne

4M: huh [huh huh huh ]

5E: [doraibaa ] o kaesanai dake de **ne**::  
screwdriver O don't-return only because ne

6E: nande atashi ga rude na no [sa: ] tte,  
why I S rude Cop Nom IP QT

7M: [u:n.]  
right

1-6E: I told him why I am rude only because I have not returned him this **ne**: crummy **ne**: screwdriver and,  
7M: Right.

In line 7 M produces an *aizuchi* ‘Ri:ght’ immediately after the nominalized structure, the potential end of the utterance. This overlaps with E’s production of the interactional particle *sa* which is followed by the quotation particle *tte* (translated as ‘I told him’ in the gloss) to the nominalized structure:

What is important here is that in lines 1, 3 and 5 E uses utterance-internal *ne* three times, each time immediately after the information units, *konna* ‘this kind’, *kogitanai* ‘crummy’ and *de* ‘because’. This is because E proposes that the information units marked with *ne* should be treated as a ground for what is to be said next as the account is gradually assembled, directing M’s acceptance of each component part. It can be said that her use of *ne* here is a rather deliberate and conscious strategy, intended to make the information units marked with *ne* more salient to M. M’s laughter after the first two utterance-internal uses of *ne* can be considered as her acceptance of this. However, the third use of utterance-internal *ne* is not responded to with a verbal acceptance. Although it is likely that M’s *aizuchi* was non-verbal, we might also argue that the force of the invitation to show acceptance of utterance-internal *ne* is less strong than in the case of utterance-final *ne*, given that information units of utterances cannot be readily refuted.

E continues talking, saying that she was scared in her room by herself, despite the fact that she was with her friend at the time the Korean man came. This is perhaps because she meant that he should have thought that she would be alone or perhaps because she pretended to be alone to blame him.

8E: .hh atashi wa koko ni hitoride ite kowai no yo tte,  
I Top here at by-myself exist scared Nom yo QT

8E:—hh-I told him—I’m scared here by myself yo?

At this point, she uses *yo* and the quotation particle *tte* again: *yo* occurs inside the quotation and therefore the force of *yo* is not directed at M but is included in what she said to the Korean man.

M's laughter follows this, and seemingly interrupts the stream of E's talk:

9M: huh huh huh huh =

10E: = **ne**. (.) *namae o kakuninsuru no wa toozen deshoo ø?*  
           ne           name O identify   Nom Top natural Tag

9M: (laughter) =

10E: = **Ne**. (.) It's natural to ask who it is, isn't it?,

Following M's laughter, E uses utterance-independent *ne*. This is not directly attached to any utterance or information unit. Instead, she proposes that what she has said so far about the event in the last several utterances should be treated as a ground for the following utterances. In this regard, M's laughter in line 9 thus plays a crucial role in marking the end of the first phrase of the account provided by E, a fact confirmed by E at her restart with the use of independent *ne*.

M does not show her verbal confirmation after E's use of utterance-independent *ne*. Indeed utterance-independent *ne* is not frequently responded to overtly because, as predicted on p.62, (a) there is no proposition of which the addressee can show acceptance and (b) it functions as an instruction, to rebase the talk, or construct a new 'base' space out of the previous viewpoint and focus spaces in Fauconnier's (1997) terms. Following the use of independent *ne*, E says that 'it's normal to ask a person to identify themselves before opening the door'. At this point, E uses *zero*. This is because the tag-like expression *deshoo* already requires the utterance to be responded to.

11M: un.  
       yeah

12E: *tte yutte heh heh heh heh heh sugoi nanka okotten no ø.*  
       QT said                                   very something angry   Nom



11M: Yeah.

12E: I said it to him, and (laughter) he was really angry ø.

M obligatorily shows her agreement with her use of ‘Yeah’. However, after M’s agreement, it is revealed in line 12 that the utterance right after the use of utterance-independent *ne* in line 10 was not directed to M but to the Korean man: E adds a quotation marker *tte* and *yutte* ‘said’ to the utterance (translated as ‘I said it to him’ in the gloss). E’s laughter follows, and then she continues her account by saying that the man was very angry. At this point, E uses *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded: she expects no particular response to it from M: it seems that E intends to indicate that the topic is potentially exhausted, although, as it happens, M chooses to continue.

### 4.3 Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to examine how the particles actually occur in unmarked talk-in-interaction involving two participants of equal status so as to test the validity of the PFH proposed in Chapter Two. In order to achieve this purpose, we used five exchanges drawn from a casual conversation between two female Japanese native speakers.

In the first three extracts, we examined *zero*, *ne*, *yo* and *yone* in their typical utterance-final position. The fourth exchange focused on how the particles *ne* and *yo* are used when the speaker is telling a story and drew attention to their use with nominalized structures. In the last exchange, we examined *ne* used utterance-internally and independently.

What should be stressed is that although the data examined above show that the

naturally occurring talk is far from simple in comparison with invented examples such as those used by other researchers and for illustrative purposes in Chapter Two, no uses of the particles or responses to them were found which could not be reconciled with the claims of the PFH. Indeed, the underlying interactionalist rationale for the PFH was amply suggested.

In the next chapter, we will continue to demonstrate how the particles in naturally occurring talk-in-interaction can be accounted for by the PFH. However, we will examine goal-oriented talk-in-interaction in which, superficially at least, the particles appear to be used with a function not typical of that found in unmarked interaction. However, it will be shown that the PFH can also account for the use of the particles *ne*, *yo*, *yone* and *zero* in an activity type which seeks to exploit their function for the strategic purposes of the participants involved in the speech event.

# **CHAPTER 5**

## **THE PARTICLES IN**

### **A MARKED TALK-IN-INTERACTION TYPE**

#### **5.1 Introduction**

In the previous chapter, we demonstrated the validity of the PFH proposed in Chapter Two with an instance of ‘small talk’ involving two female native Japanese speakers. We regarded this instance as ‘unmarked’ talk in that the communicative goals were intrinsic rather than extrinsic, i.e. they were produced during the talk rather than pre-existing it (and therefore predetermining its course).

In this chapter, we will examine an instance of marked talk, where the goals are extrinsic and pre-exist the talk, so as to show that the PFH continues to be explanatorily adequate in a marked talk event. We suppose that participants’ intentionality in the use of language is more evident in marked or goal-directed talk than in unmarked or everyday talk for the reason that, in the former kind of talk-in-interaction, participants will attempt to control the direction the conversation takes so as to accomplish their goals. Because they pre-exist the talk, these goals are essentially extrinsic to the communication rather than intrinsic in the way that unmarked methods, such as turns, and the conversation events that arise in an unplanned way might be said to be.

Therefore, we may suppose that the participants are more likely to use the particles and respond to utterances in which the particles occur in ways that are harder to predict because of the particularity of goal-directed talk-in-interaction. It can be

argued, in other words, that such particle use and response is marked rather than unmarked in terms of unexpectedness and furthermore dispreferred rather than preferred in terms of their contribution to the conversational sequence. Mey states:

a 'marked' sequence is structurally richer and more complex than an 'unmarked' one (often termed the 'default') ... Marked behaviors are ... dispreferred because they require more effort on the part of the users, which usually results in a noticeable deviance from what is expected or accepted (Mey, 2001: 152).

The issue, then, is whether these less predictable uses can be reconciled with the PFH. This will be tested in the analysis of the activity type talk that follows.

## **5.2 The particles in a marked talk type**

### **5.2.1 Data**

In order to test the validity of our hypotheses in goal-directed talk, as already mentioned in 3.4.2.4, a six-minute radio exchange between a popular male singer aged 30 acting as presenter (hereafter P), and a caller to P's radio show will be analysed. This exchange took place in the programme in which P interviews callers who have recently been 'dumped' by their partners, with a view to making two new 'happy couples' from among the callers. During the interviews, the callers therefore try to make a good impression on P since only two men and two women are to be selected to come to the studio in Tokyo in order to meet each other there.

The data discussed in this chapter chart the course of a single call made by Jun, a 23 year-old man (hereafter J) in a programme broadcast on 23 July, 2000. The radio exchange which takes place between P and J is a good example of goal-oriented talk-in-

interaction: P needs to discover what kind of a man J is so as to determine whether he would make an appropriate person to invite to the studio. For his part, J needs to make a good impression on P in order to secure an invitation. In addition to this, as the presenter of the programme, P is responsible for making the exchange interesting for what Greatbatch (1988) and others have called the ‘overhearing audience’.

### **5.2.2 Analysis**

We will test the validity of the PFH with five extracts drawn from the talk-in-interaction data mentioned above. These extracts will be presented in the order in which they occurred in the interview so as to show the flow of the interview straightforwardly; we can probably argue that considering the flow of conversation is important, particularly when the talk-in-interaction is goal oriented, since the flow is clearly related to the achievement of the goal of the talk.

Of the five extracts to be considered, two (Extracts 1 and 5) show predominantly prototypical occurrences of particles and responses parallel to those found in the unmarked talk-in-interaction described in the previous chapter, and three (Extracts 2, 3 and 4) show atypical occurrences of particle use and response of a kind we would not expect to find in unmarked talk. However, we will demonstrate that atypical uses can still be reconciled with the PFH, arguing that such uses show the participants’ orientation to the activity type in which they are engaged.

As in the previous chapter, in considering each extract we will first present a synopsis of the exchange and then move to an analysis of each focused instance.

### 5.2.2.1 Extract 1- Tactical but unmarked occurrences of particles and responses (1)

#### *Synopsis: content*

In this exchange, which occurs just after the opening of the interview, P inquires about J's occupation and J tells P that he is a care-worker. P tells J that he is a kind person, and J tells P that he, J, can take care of a girlfriend until either he or she dies. To put it another way, at the start of the interview, P intends to establish a positive context between himself and J, by extracting information which is favourable to J.

#### *Synopsis: particle use*

In this exchange, the particles *zero*, *ne* and *yo* occur. All the occurrences of the particles and responses are (proto)-typical and predicted by the PFH.

#### *Data*

(From line 18 to line 33 in Appendix B)

1P: e:: donna shigoto o yatteiru n desu ka ima ø? =  
er what-kind-of job O do Nom Cop Q now

2J: = a (.) fukushi kei na n desu yo: =  
oh welfare relation Cop Nom Cop yo

3P: = a:[:: ] kokoro no yasashi[i ] hito [da:: ø.]  
oh heart LK kind person Cop

4J: [hai.] [hai.] [dakara ] (.)  
yes yes therefore

5J: moshi kanjo dekitara:,  
if girlfriend can-have-Conditional

6P: u::n. =  
uh-huh

7J: = moo (.) shinu made kaigodekimasu ø. huh hu[h ]  
Intensifier die until can-nurse

8P: [ma]a sore wa  
well that Top

9P: hito ni yorokobareru shigoto da kara **ne**.  
person by is-appreciated job Cop because ne

10J: [hai. (.) hai.]  
yes yes

11P: [kaigo tte no wa **ne**.]  
nursing such-as thing Top ne

12J: kanari **o**.  
very-much

13P: u::n. =  
right

14J: = hai.  
yes

15 (0.3)

16P: de sa: chotto kininatteita no ga::,  
and IP little disturbing matter S

(gloss)

1P: Er:: what kind of job do you do now **o**? =

2J: = Oh (.) my job is to do with welfare **yo**. =

3P: = O::h you are a kind person **o**.

4/5J: Yes. Yes. So (.) if I find a girlfriend,

6P: Uh-huh. =

7J: =I'll definitely take care of her until I (or she) die **o**. (laughter).

8/9P: Well it's a job where people appreciate you **ne**.

10J: Yes. (.) Yes.

11P: The caring professions, I mean **ne**.

12J: Very much **o**.

13P: Righ::t. =

14J: = Yes.

15 (0.3)

16P: There's just something bothering me,

## *Analysis*

P begins the interview by inquiring about J's occupation:

1P: e:: donna shigoto o yatteiru n desu ka ima **o**?. =  
er what-kind-of job O do Nom Cop Q now

1P: Er:: what kind of job do you do now **o**? =

Although P asks J what his occupation is, presumably P already has this information in his briefing notes. That is to say, P asks this question for the benefit of the overhearing





5J: moshi kanjo            dekitara:,  
       if        girlfriend can-have-Conditional

6P: u::n. =  
       uh-huh

7J: = moo (.)        shinu made kaigodekimasu 0. huh hu[h ]  
       Intensifier die     until can-nurse

4/5J: Yes. Yes. So (.) if I find a girlfriend,  
 6P:     Uh-huh. =  
 7J:     = I will definitely take care of her until I (or she) die 0. (laughter)

This utterance can be also considered as an assumptive response to his own *yo*-utterance in line 2: *dakara* (therefore) in line 4 indicates that the proposition in lines 4, 5 and 7 is logically connected to the proposition in line 2. That is to say, J and P both react to the force of *yo* in J's utterance in line 2. At this point (line 7), J uses *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded: he requires no particular response from P. This might be because he considers that the proposition in lines 4-7 completes his aim of making a good impression. However, it is likely that his use of *zero* here also orients to the activity type in which he and P are engaged: if this exchange had occurred in casual conversation involving good friends, *yo* might have occurred at this point instead of *zero*. However, *zero* occurs since J intends to refrain from influencing the flow of conversation too much for the reason that it is P as presenter interviewer and not J as caller interviewee whose role is to organise the flow of conversation and control the topic. Thus, J's use of *zero* here is tactical but unmarked. His subsequent laughter may also indicate the fact that he does not expect to have a particular response from P.

Overlapping J's laughter, P reflects on J's comment by saying that people generally have a high opinion of care-workers:

7J: = moo (.)        shinu made kaigodekimasu 0. huh hu[h ]  
       Intensifier die     until can-nurse

8P: [ma]a sore wa  
well that Top

9P: hito ni yorokobareru shigoto da kara **ne**.  
person by is-appreciated job Cop because ne

10J: [hai. (.) hai.]  
yes yes

7J: = I will definitely take care of her until I (or she) die ø (laughter).  
8/9P: Well it's a job where people appreciate you **ne**.  
10J: Yes. (.) Yes.

He use *ne*, which signals his intention that the figure emerging in the talk should be treated as a ground for the next proposition without further ado, and directs J's acceptance of it: P obligatorily asks J to accept the proposition as a ground since the proposition contained in lines 8-9 is commonly accepted in Japanese society and it is therefore conventional for J to show his acceptance. J behaves as one might expect, and shows his acceptance with his use of *hai hai* (Yes. (.) Yes.) in line 10. Overlapping J's utterance, P uses *ne* again in emphasising his attitudes with regard to the subject, the caring professions, that he had been talking about:

8P: [ma]a sore wa  
well that Top

9P: hito ni yorokobareru shigoto da kara **ne**.  
person by is-appreciated job Cop because ne

10J: [hai. (.) hai.]  
yes yes

11P: [kaigo tte no wa **ne**.]  
nursing such-as thing Top ne

12J: kanari ø.  
very-much

8/9P: Well it's a job where people appreciate you **ne**.  
10J: Yes (.) Yes.  
11P: The caring professions, I mean **ne**.  
12J: Very much ø.

Reacting to the force of *ne* in line 11, J shows his acceptance again, with *kanari* (very much). At this point, J uses *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in

the talk is to be grounded: he requires no particular response from P probably because he does not intend to develop the topic further. A 0.3 second pause in lines 15 indicates that the topic is exhausted. In line 16, P then moves to a new sub-topic:

13P: u::n. =  
right  
14J: = hai.  
yes.  
15 (0.3)  
16P: de sa: chotto kininatteita no ga::,  
and IP little disturbing matter S  
13P: Righ::t. =  
14J: = Yes.  
15 (0.3)  
16P: There's just something bothering me,

In the above extract, we have examined unmarked but tactical occurrences of particles and responses. In the following sections we will analyse an extract where particles and responses are both tactical and marked.

#### **5.2.2.2 Extract 2 - Tactical and marked occurrences of particles and responses (1)**

##### ***Synopsis: content***

This exchange, which occurs immediately after the extract analysed in the previous section, starts with P asking J if he asked his ex-girlfriend about the occasion when he saw her with another man. J tells P that he did not and P repeatedly criticises him for not asking. This is the first hard topic for J in the interview. That is to say, having established a positive context between himself and J, as seen in Extract 1, P then introduces a negative context. He does this by first establishing the topic in a friendly way before criticising J's action.

### ***Synopsis: particle use***

In this exchange, P repeatedly uses *yo* with a bullying effect. This is achieved by directing an assumptive response which J is reluctant to produce. As mentioned before, this use of *yo* does not typically occur in unmarked talk-in-interaction. It can be argued that the use of *yo* shows P's orientation to the activity in which he and J are engaged: P repeatedly uses *yo* in a malicious way, aiming to tease J so as to entertain the overhearing audience.

### ***Data***

(From line 35 to line 59 in Appendix B)

- 1P: anoo:: kanojo::: ni,  
well girlfriend to
- 2J: hai.  
yes
- 3P: hoka no otoko:: (1.8) to doraibushitteiru tokoro  
other LK man:: with is-driving scene
- 4P: o mokugekishita wake [sho ø? (kanojo ga).]  
O witnessed Nom Tag girlfriend S
- 5J: [hai hai. ] (.) hai. =  
yes yes yes
- 6P: = sore o toitsume tari shita no ø?  
that O question-closely or-anything did Nom
- 7J: a (.) shitenai desu zenzen ø.  
er didn't-do Cop at-all
- 8 (0.3)
- 9P: NANDE SHINAI N DA YO::. =  
why don't-do Nom Cop yo
- 10J: = e (.) na- nande suru n desu ka ø? (.) hah hah hah [( )]  
er why do Nom Cop Q
- 11P: [datte ]  
because
- 12J: riyuu ga wakannai jan ø (.) hyottoshitara nanraka  
reason S don't-know Tag possibly some-kind-of
- 13J: no riyuu ga atta kamoshinnai n [(da yo::.)]  
LK reason S existed may Nom Cop yo

14J: [a:: ]:: demo nanka  
well but something

15J: sono toki wa:::,  
that time Top

16P: u::n.  
uh-huh

17J: .hh zenzen dame datta n desu **yo::**.  
at-all bad was Nom Cop yo

18 (0.8)

19P: ja: sore ja: datte (.) KOKORO NO KOORYUU GA DEKITENAI  
then that then because heart LK communication S can't-do

20P: WAKE **YO::** =  
Nom yo

21J: = iya: tte jibun mo soo omoimashita ku- kanari heh [heh heh] .hh u::n.  
well Comp self too so thought fairly yeah

22P: [EE::! ]  
yeah

23P: sore tte honto: no su- hone no tokoro de (.)  
that QT real LK real-thought LK place at

24P: koosaiDEKITENAKATTA WAKE **YO::** =  
couldn't-associate Nom yo

25J: = u::n. (.) to omoimashita **ø**.  
yeah Comp thought

(gloss)

1-4P: We:ll you saw your girlfriend out for a drive with another guy, didn't you **ø**?  
5J: Yes yes. (.) Yes. =  
6P: = Did you ask her about it **ø**?  
7J: Er (.) I didn't at all **ø**.  
8 (0.3)  
9P: Why don't you ask her **yo::**? =  
10J: = Er (.) wh- why would I do that **ø**? (laughter) ( )  
11-13P: Because you don't know the reason why she was out with him **ø**. There probably was some reason  
or other (**yo::**).  
14/15J: We:::ll but at the time,  
16P: Uh-huh.  
17J: .hh I just couldn't do it **yo::**.  
18 (0.8)  
19/20P: If it is the case, you are not really communicating with her wake **yo::**! =  
21J: = I've wondered the same thing myself, quite a bit **ø**. (laughter) Yea::h.  
22-24P: You understand, right! I mean that you weren't really with her in any real sense **yo::**! =  
25J: = Yea::h. I thought I wasn't **ø**.

### Analysis

P asks J to confirm that he saw his then girlfriend with another man. The tag-like expression *deshoo* pre-empts the need for a particle. After J shows understanding of P's

account, P goes on to ask J if he asked her about it:

- 1P: anoo:: kanojo::: ni,  
well girlfriend to
- 2J: hai.  
yes
- 3P: hoka no otoko:: (1.8) to doraibusitteiru tokoro  
other LK man:: with is-driving scene
- 4P: o mokugekishita wake [sho ø? (kanojo ga).]  
O witnessed Nom Tag girlfriend S
- 5J: [hai hai. ] (.) hai. =  
yes yes yes
- 6P: = sore o toitsume tari shita no ø?  
that O question-closely or-anything did Nom
- 1-4P: We::If you saw your girlfriend out for a drive with another guy, didn't you ø?
- 5J: Yes yes. (.) Yes. =
- 6P: = Did you ask her about it ø?

At this point, P uses *zero* since the utterance type, a question, directs a matching second pair-part, which, after a filler (er) and a micro pause (.), J duly produces:

- 7J: a (.) shitenai desu zenzen ø.  
er didn't-do Cop at-all
- 8 (0.3)
- 7J: Er (.) I didn't at all ø.
- 8 (0.3)

In telling P that he did not ask her about the incident, J uses *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded. This is perhaps because he does not want the topic to proceed because he must have guessed, given the trajectory of the exchange up to this point, that P's contribution would be likely to be critical. J's contribution is followed by a 0.3 second pause, which may indicate an expectation on P's part that J will produce some kind of reason why he had not challenged his girlfriend. When no reason is forthcoming, P uses an interrogative sentence; as we hypothesises on pp.52-54 in Chapter Two, the sentence type can be marked with *yo* only when it does not function as a genuine question. That is to say, although an interrogative

is used here, it functions obviously as an indirect assertion that J should have asked his girlfriend about the event:

9P: NANDE SHINAI N DA YO::? =  
 why don't-do Nom Cop yo

9P: Why don't you ask her yo::? =

P uses the present tense instead of the past tense. This is probably because P's concern is more about J's state of mind than about what he did. J's response in line 10, which is shown below, seems also to be directed to conduct in general rather than the particular instance. P marks his indirect criticism of J with *yo* because he intends it to be grounded in the expectation that it is controversial, and also directs an assumptive response. A preferred assumptive response might be an acceptance of P's indirect criticism such as 'Yeah, I should have asked her'. Because such a response could be taken as an admission of weakness, it is not surprising that J tries a different tack and, in a latched response, asks P why he would ask her about it:

10J: = e (.) na- nande suru n desu ka ø? (.) hah hah hah [( )]  
 er why do Nom Cop Q

10J: = Er (.) wh- why would I do that ø? (laughter) ( )

J's answer here clearly shows that he took P's utterance in line 9 not as a direct question but as an indirect assertion, i.e. he understood it as a criticism. J uses *zero* here because the utterance type, a question, already requires an answer in the next turn, which P duly provides:

11P: [datte ]  
 because

12P: riyuu ga wakan nai jan ø.(.) hyottoshitara nanraka  
 reason S know Neg Tag possibly some-kind-of

13P: no riyuu ga atta kamoshinnai n [(da yo::.)]  
 LK reason S existed may Nom Cop yo

14J: [a:: ]:: demo nanka  
well but something

15J: sono toki wa:::,  
that time Top

11-13P: Because you don't know the reason why she was out with him ø. There probably was some reason  
or other (yo::).

14/15J: We:::ll but at the time,

Answering J's question, P tells him that he (J) does not know the reason for his girlfriend being in a car with another man. He then suggests that J should have asked as she might have had a simple reason for being with someone else. At this point, he uses *yo*, intending the figure emerging in the talk to be grounded in the expectation that it is contentious and also directing an assumptive response. J's utterance overlaps the end of P's utterance, which suggests either that he may not have registered P's use of *yo* in line 13 or that he anticipates it and sets about responding to it in an overlapped utterance. His overlapped response also suggests that J probably wanted to lose no time in justifying what he did about the event in order to save face:

14J: [a:: ]:: demo nanka  
well but something

15J: sono toki wa:::,  
that time Top

16P: u::n.  
uh-huh

17J: .hh zenzen dame datta n desu **yo**:::  
at-all bad was Nom Cop yo

18 (0.8)

14/15J: We:::ll but at the time,

16P: Uh-huh.

17J: .hh I just couldn't do it yo::.

18 (0.8)

J tells P that he could not ask her about the event and marks his assumptive response with *yo*, intending the figure emerging in the talk to be grounded and also directing an assumptive response. The preferred assumptive response here might be for P to show



his sympathy for J. That is to say, by using *yo*, J tries to escape from P's repeated criticism in his previous turns. However, J's account is followed by a 0.8 second pause. This pause may indicate that P does not expect J to conclude so rapidly that he had failed and that he is being allowed additional processing time in which to come up with an appropriate contribution. After the pause, instead of showing his understanding of J's position, the preferred assumptive response at least from J's perspective, P interprets J's failure to seek an explanation as evidence of his inability to communicate with his girlfriend:

19P: ja: sore ja: datte (.) KOKORO NO KOORYUU GA DEKITENAI  
 then that then because heart LK communication S can't-do

20P: WAKE **YO**::. =  
 Nom yo

19/20P: If that's the case, you are not really communicating with her wake **yo**::! =

At this point, P uses *yo*, intending the figure emerging in the talk to be grounded in the expectation that it is controversial, and also directing an assumptive response: he uses *yo* again as a forcing device to make J to accept his harsh criticism. Once again J anticipates the need for an assumptive response, and in a latched reply admits that the same thought had occurred to him:

21J: = iya: tte jibun mo soo omoimashita ku- kanari heh [heh heh] .hh u::n.  
 well Comp self too so thought fairly yeah

21J: = I've wondered the same thing myself, quite a bit **o**. (laughter) .hh Yea::h.

That is to say, he stops justifying himself and accepts P's repeated criticism. At this point, J uses *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded: it seems that he does not want to continue this topic. Then he laughs, probably in order to hide his embarrassment at accepting P's criticism. Despite J's

accepting that he may be a poor communicator, P still continues to criticise him, saying that J was not with his girlfriend in any real sense:

- 22P: [EE::! ]  
yeah
- 23P: sore tte honto: no su- hone no tokoro de (.)  
that QT real LK real-thought LK place at
- 24P: koosaiDEKITENAKATTA WAKE YO::. =  
couldn't-associate Nom yo
- 25J: = u::n. (.) to omoimashita ø.  
yeah Comp thought
- 22/23/24P: You understand, right! I mean that you weren't really with her in any real sense yo::.=
- 25J: Yea::h. I thought I wasn't ø.

At this point, he uses *yo* again, once more directing an assumptive response from J. In a further latched response, reacting to the force of *yo* in P's assertion, J again admits that he had thought that he had not been with her in any real sense. At this point, J again uses *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded: he requires no particular response and in the process conveys to P that he is reluctant to continue the topic.

This exchange shows P's persistent bullying or humiliation of J. By using *yo*, P continuously directs J to produce the response that J does not want to produce, i.e. to admit to or to specify the nature of his foolish behaviour - a response that would also be likely to make him a losing candidate. J's feeble responses to P's suggestions makes the exchange more entertaining for the kind of overhearing audience that this programme attracts. We thus readily see that despite this exchange being far from prototypical in talk-in-interaction, the PFH not only holds but is also required in order to explain the way in which P's contributions (and to a lesser extent J's, too) orient to the activity type.

### 5.2.2.3 Extract 3 - Tactical and marked occurrences of particles and responses (2)

#### *Synopsis: content*

Having created a negative context between himself and J by criticising J for not having asked his ex-girlfriend about the occasion when he saw her with another man, P then creates a positive context between them by asking about his hobby.<sup>1</sup> This is followed by the extract analysed below. In this part of the exchange, P says that his impression of J is that he seems good at listening to stories told by the elderly at his work-place. That is to say, as with the two extracts examined before, P first establishes a platform between himself and J, which J will easily accept as the start of the new topic. Responding to P's positive comment, J tells P that he talks as well as listens. However, it seems that P does not like J's saying something which is not asked for, probably because such behaviour might be thought to compromise the role of the presenter who organises the flow of the exchange. P reacts to J's comment (i.e. he is also a good talker) by telling J that he does not seem to be a good talker. In order to refute P's unexpected criticism, J states that he, J, talks like a comedian.

#### *Synopsis: particle use*

In this exchange, the particles *zero*, *ne* and *yo* occur. All occurrences except one instance can be readily predicted by the PFH: there is one instance where P adds *ne* to an utterance (it seems you are not a good talker) which is very difficult for J to accept as a ground for the next proposition without further ado. This use is problematical since it

---

<sup>1</sup> See lines 63-76 in Appendix B.

is hypothesised that in the PFH *ne* is prototypically used when the speaker expects the addressee to be willing to accept the figure emerging in the talk marked with *ne* to be grounded without further ado. However, we will reconcile this use of *ne* with the PFH, arguing that the non-prototypical use of *ne* in this case shows P's orientation to the activity type and that he uses *ne* maliciously, intending to entertain the audience by making fun of J through putting him in a difficult situation, a context which is unlikely to occur in everyday interaction.

### **Data**

(From line 89 to line 108 in Appendix B)

- 1P: .hh ojiichan to obaachan no hanashi o yoku (.) kiki  
old-men and old-women LK story O well listen
- 2P: soo da **ne**: jun kun [wa].  
seem Cop ne Jun Title Top
- 3J: [a ] kikimasu **yo**. hah hah .hh =  
oh listen yo
- 4P: = kikijoozu daro **o**.  
good-at-listening Tag
- 5J: ki- kimasu **o**. hai. (.) a kedo shaberimasu **o**.  
listen yes oh but talk
- 6 (1.0)
- 7P: demo shaberi:: wa anmari joozujanasa[soo da **ne**.]  
but talk Top very don't-seem-skilful Cop ne
- 8J: [a:: nanka ]  
er something
- 9J: shaberi- nanka tomodachi kara iwareru n desu **yo**.  
talk something friend by am-told Nom Cop yo
- 10P: a::n.  
uh-huh
- 11J: nanka (0.8) koo otonashikushitereba,  
something er keep-quiet-Conditional
- 12P: u:n.  
uh-huh
- 13J: nimaime na n da kedo:, =  
cool Cop Nom Cop but

14P: = iya dakara nimaime jana[i ø. ]  
           no so cool Cop-Neg

15B: [(laughter)][(laughter)]

16J: [(laughter)][(laughter)]

17J: .hh hanashi ga sanmaime na n desu yo::.  
           talk S comedian-like Cop Nom Cop yo

18P: dakara iya iya jya- ni[mai ]me janai kara ø!  
           so no no cool Cop-Neg because

19J: [hai.]  
           yes

20J: hai. (laughter)  
           yes

(gloss)

1/2P: Apparently you're good at listening to the stories of old folks **ne**, Jun?

3J: Oh I listen **yo**. (laughter) =

4P: = You must be a good listener, mustn't you **ø**?

5J: I listen **ø**, yes. (.) Oh but I talk **ø**.

6 (1.0)

7P: But it seems you're not a good talker **ne**.

8/9J: With respect to talk er there's something I'm told by my friends **yo**.

10P: Uh-huh.

11J: Er (0.8) keeping my mouth shut,

12P: Uh-huh.

13J: makes me cool but, =

14P: = No, I told you before, you're not cool **ø**.

15B: (laughter)

16J: (laughter)

17J: .hh My talk is like a comedian's **yo**::.

18P: No no, as I said, you are not cool **ø**!

20J: Yes. (laughter)

## *Analysis*

As mentioned above, as the start of a new topic, P tries to establish a platform between himself by telling J something he has inferred about him from their conversation, that J is considerate to the older generation (he is a care-worker) and that he listens carefully to what older people say:

1P: .hh ojiichan to obaachan no hanashi o yoku (.) kiki  
           old-men and old-women LK story O well listen

2P: soo da **ne**: jun kun [wa].  
           seem Cop ne Jun Title Top

1/2P: Apparently you're good at listening to the stories of old folks **ne**, Jun?

3J: [a ] kikimasu **yo**. hah hah .hh =  
oh listen yo

3J: Oh I listen **yo**. (laughter) =

4P: = kikijoozu                      daro ø.  
          good-at-listening Tag

4P: = You must be a good listener, mustn't you ø?

5J: ki- kimasu o. hai. (.) a kedo shaberimasu o.  
listen yes oh but talk

6 (1.0)

5J: I listen o, yes. (.) Oh but I talk o.

6 (1.0)

149

he talks as well as listens; he may think that accepting too many compliments is a sign of weakness. And obviously enough someone who is a good listener and talker is a better prospect as a boyfriend than someone who is only a good listener. At this point, J again uses *zero*. His repeated use of *zero* here seems to be influenced by the activity type in which he and P are engaged: *yo* might be considered more expectable than *zero* in an exchange between friends. However, as we discussed in Extract 1 (p.136), J's repeated use of *zero* here shows orientation to the activity type and his intention to avoid controlling the flow of conversation since this is P's and not his role. J's assertion is followed by a one-second pause, which perhaps allows time for P to look for an appropriate next contribution. It also suggests that P did not expect J's second proposition in line 5. When P's response comes, it is introduced by *demo* (but):

7P: *demo shaberi:: wa anmari joozujanasa[soo da ne.]*  
 but talk Top very don't-seem-skilful Cop ne

7P: But it seems you're not a good talker *ne*.

P comments that J does not seem to be a good talker. This is obviously something of a blow for a contestant who is hoping to prove his qualifications as a new dating partner. Moreover, P adds *ne* to his comment, proposing that the figure emerging in the talk which directly contradicts what J had just said should be treated as a ground for the next proposition without further ado and thus agreed to by J. P's use of *ne* here would not be found in unmarked talk such as casual conversation between friends, since in such a talk-type a speaker does not force an addressee to accept as a ground for the next contribution to the conversation a proposition with which they cannot possibly agree. That is to say, P's use of *ne* here signals his clear orientation to the activity type in which he is engaged: P intends to make the exchange more entertaining for the audience by making J appear flustered by the use of *ne*. J starts responding to P's assertion in line

7, overlapping the end of it. That is to say, J starts to introduce a new topic before P's use of *ne* because he does not want the proposition, which is likely to cause him damage as a candidate, to go any further:

7P: demo shaberi:: wa anmari joozujanasa[soo da **ne**.]  
but talk Top very don't-seem-skilful Cop ne

8J: [a:: nanka ]  
er something

9J: shaberi- nanka tomodachi kara iwareru n desu **yo**.  
talk something friend by am-told Nom Cop yo

7P: But it seems you're not a good talker **ne**.

8/9J: With respect to talk er there's something I'm told by my friends **yo**.

J tells P that there is something his friends say, but it seems from the repair that follows *shaberi- nanka* in line 7 (represented as 'With respect to talk er' in the transcription) that he has difficulty in putting what his friends say about him into words immediately. He therefore merely repeats that his friends say something (presumably significant) about him and completes the suspended turn with *yo*.

10P: a::n.  
uh-huh

10P: Uh-huh.

J then starts telling P what his friends say about him by way of an assumptive continuation, saying that if he does not talk much, he can be cool:

11J: nanka (0.8) koo otonashikushitereba,  
something er keep-quiet-Conditional

12P: u:n.  
uh-huh

13J: nimaime na n da kedo: ,=  
cool Cop Nom Cop but

11J: Er (0.8) keeping my mouth shut,

12P: Uh-huh.

13J: makes me cool but, =





favourable assumptive response; it seems that J uses *yo* here since he thinks that he makes a telling point. However, P tells J again that he, J, is not cool:

18P: dakara iya iya jya- ni[mai ]me janai kara ø!  
because no no cool Cop-Neg because

19J: [hai.]  
yes

20J: hai. (laughter)  
yes

18P: No no you are not cool ø!

20J: Yes. (laughter)

At this point, he again marks the utterance with *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded: he requires no particular response from J probably for the same reason that he used *zero* in line 14. J finally accepts P's opinion and then laughs.

#### 5.2.2.4 Extract 4 - Tactical and marked occurrences of particles and responses (3)

##### *Synopsis: content*

Having created a negative context between himself and J by telling J that he is neither handsome nor a good talker, as seen in Extract 3, P then continues creating a negative context in the exchange we will examine below. However, again P does not seem to have intended to do it from the beginning of the exchange. Rather, it seems that J's utterance accidentally invites P to create a negative context. This exchange starts with P asking J if J picks up girls when he goes drinking with his male friends. J tells P that he likes 'normal' girls, implying that girls who are easy to pick up are not normal. P responds by telling J that picking up girls is normal. J then re-affirms his position, stating that he likes 'innocent' girls. This prompts P to ask J if he has chances to meet

girls through his work. J tells P that he has already had some offers from this source. This answer causes P tell J that he is disqualified from the contest since he has easy access to girls.

### ***Synopsis: particle use***

Like the exchange in the previous extract, in this exchange, P repeatedly bullies J in the way he uses *yo*, directing assumptive responses which J cannot produce without loss of face. As mentioned in the previous extract, this use of *yo* does not occur typically in an unmarked talk-in-interaction type where the production of an assumptive response does not entail a loss of face. We argue again that such uses of *yo* show P's orientation to the activity in which he and J are engaged and can be considered a malicious strategy on P's part to put J in a difficult position so as to make the interview more entertaining for the overhearing audience.

### ***Data***

(From line 117 to line 147 in Appendix B)

- 1P: nde ano:::: (.) tomodachi nanka to:: nominii  
and er friends or-something with go-to-drink
- 2P: ttari shite sa (.) nanpa toka shinai no ø?  
or-something do IP girl-hunting and-so-on don't-do Nom
- 3J: iya: mae:: shita n desu kedo:, =  
well before did Nom Cop but
- 4P: = u:n. =  
uh-huh
- 5J: = nanka anmari (.) sooiu: no iya na n desu yo:.  
something very such Nom dislike Cop Nom Cop yo
- 6P: a::[::( )]  
all right
- 7J: [ko- nan-] nanka (0.8) futsuu no hito ga ii tte iu ka::,  
something normal LK person S good OT say or
- 8P: futsuu no [hito tte,]  
normal LK person QT

9B: [(laughter) ]

10J: [(laughter) ] futsuu tte iu ka,  
normal QT say Q

11P: [FUTUU DA YO. (.) BETSUNI NANPA] WA! =  
normal Cop yo not-especially girl-hunting Top

12J: [( ) (.) iya ] iya sooiu imi janakute:, =  
no no such meaning Cop-Neg-and

13P: = u::n.  
uh-huh

14J: koo ojoosama mitai no ga suki na n desu 0.  
er a-girl-who-comes-from-a-good-family alike one S like Cop Nom Cop

15J: .hh huh huh huh [huh huh huh huh ]

16P: [OMAE sa::,]  
you IP

17J: hai. (laughter) [(laughter)]  
yes

18P: [ja: oj- ] sono kaigoshiteiru ojiichan obaachan no::  
if-so that nursing old-men old-women LK

19P: ano musume toka mago [toka,]  
well daughters and-so-on grandchildren and-so-on

20J: [a a] sore mo hanashi  
oh oh that too story

21J: mo aru n desu yo:: =  
too exist Nom Cop yo

22P: = ARU N JANEE [KA YO::!]  
exist Nom Cop-Neg Q yo

23J: [da- da]kedo da[kedo,]  
but but

24P: [omae ] shikkaku da yo:  
you disqualification Cop yo

25P: o[mae] sa::! =  
you IP

26J: [.hh]

27J: = iya (.) dakedo,  
no but

28P: EE:! =  
yes

29J: = dakedo (0.5) nanka mada sooiu  
but something not-yet such

30J: omiai toka  
a-formal-meeting-with-a-view-to-marriage and-so-on  
(continue)

(gloss)

- 1/2P: And er::: (.) when you go drinking with your friends, don't you pick up girls ø?  
3J: We:ll I did before, but, =  
4P: = Uh-huh. =  
5J: = I don't like that kind of thing very much yo:.  
6P: A::ll r::ight. ( )  
7J: I like, what should I say, normal girls,  
8P: A normal girl!  
9B: (laughter)  
10J: (laughter) Normal or,  
11P: Picking up a girl is normal yo!  
12J: ( ) (.) No no that's not what I mean, =  
13P: = Uh-huh.  
14/15J: er I fancy kind of innocent girls ø. (laughter)  
16P: You!  
17J: Yes. (laughter)  
18/19P: So the daughters and grandchildren of the old men and women you're talking care of,  
20/21J: Oh oh I do get offers like that yo:: =  
22P: = So you do have offers then yo::!  
23J: Bu- but but,  
24/25P: You are disqualified yo: you! =  
27J: = No (.) but,  
28P: Do you understand? =  
29/30J: = But (0.5) I'm not ready for anything like an arranged date,

(continue)

## Analysis

Like the extracts examined above, P tries to establish a platform between himself and P at the start of a new topic, this time by asking J if he picks up girls when he goes drinking with his male friends:

- 1P: nde ano:::: (.) tomodachi nanka to:: nominii  
and er friends or-something with go-to-drink  
2P: ttari shite sa (.) nanpa toka shinai no ø?  
or-something do IP girl-hunting and-so-on don't-do Nom  
1/2P: And er::: (.) when you go drinking with your friends, don't you pick up girls ø?

At this point, he uses *zero* since the utterance type, a yes/no question, requires a second pair-part of a specified type. J answers that he does not like to pick up girls:

- 3J: iya: mae:: shita n desu kedo:, =  
well before did Nom Cop but

4P: = u:n =  
uh-huh

5J: = nanka anmari (.) sooiu: no iya na n desu yo:.  
something very such Nom dislike Cop Nom Cop yo

3J: We'll I did before, but, =

4P: = Uh-huh. =

5J: = I don't like that kind of thing very much yo:.

J uses *yo* here, intending the figure emerging in the talk to be grounded and directing an assumptive response: he probably uses *yo* because not wanting to pick girls up might be considered a qualification for doing well in the competition and his response is therefore point scoring. P's response is fairly minimal:

6P: a::[::( )]  
all right

6P: A::ll r:right. ( )

P shows his understanding, which can be considered as a minimally assumptive response. Either having been prompted by P's minimal response, or reacting to the force of *yo* in his own previous assertion, J then tells P that the reason he does not like picking up girls is that he likes what he calls 'normal' girls:

7J: [ko- nan-] nanka (0.8) futsuu no hito ga ii tte iu ka::,  
something normal LK person S good QT say or

7J: I like, what should I say, normal girls,

In a metalinguistic contribution, P then questions J's choice of expression:

8P: futsuu no [hito tte,]  
normal LK person QT

9B: [(laughter) ]

10J: [(laughter) ] futsuu tte iu ka,  
normal QT say Q

8P: A normal girl!

9B: (laughter)

10J: (laughter) Normal or,

This turn constitutes a criticism of J's notion that the girls who are easily picked up by men are not normal and triggers the laughter of J and somebody in the studio ('B' in the transcription). Then, J starts modifying what he meant by his assertion in line 7, by saying 'Normal or...', but P interrupts:

Before J has a chance to justify what he means by 'normal', P tells him loudly that picking girls up is normal. He uses *yo*, because he intends the figure emerging in the talk to be grounded and also directs an assumptive response. A preferred assumptive response might be an implicit agreement, possibly something like 'Yeah, I am a young man, aren't I?'. P's use of *yo* here would be very unlikely in everyday talk-in-interaction (unless P were going to respond himself) because what J has said up to this point indicates that he is not going to be able to provide such a response. Indeed, as one might expect given the trajectory of the exchange up to this point, J declines to produce an assumptive response, and continues as though the interaction had not occurred by clarifying what he meant by 'normal', this time stating that he likes 'innocent' girls:

At this point, J uses *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk







26J: [.hh]

27J: = iya (.) dakedo  
no but

27J: = No (.) but,

J's response 'No (.) but' signals that an attempt to refute the explicit accusation in lines 24-25 is upcoming and indicates that J is not able to produce an assumptive response immediately. P then interrupts to reinforce his accusation:

28P: EE:! =  
yes

29J: = dakedo (0.5) nanka mada sooiu  
but something not-yet such

30J: omiai toka  
a-formal-meeting-with-a-view-to-marriage and-so-on

28P: Do you understand? =

29/30J: = But (0.5) I'm not ready for anything like an arranged date,

After P's EE:! (Do you understand?), J is finally able to start justifying himself, by saying that it is too early for him to have a formal meeting with a view to marriage, thereby implying that he ought not to be disqualified.

#### **5.2.2.5 Extract 5 - Tactical but unmarked occurrences of particles and responses (2)**

##### ***Synopsis: content***

Having created the negative context between himself and J which started with the topic about picking up girls as seen in Extract 4, P then goes on to create a positive context by talking about another of J's hobbies, *bonsai*. However, it seems that P chooses this topic not because he intends J to talk about *bonsai*, which may make a

good impression on P and the overhearing audience, but because he, P, intends to show off his own knowledge of the topic to J and to the overhearing audience.

### ***Synopsis: particle use***

In this exchange, all of the particles *zero*, *ne*, *yo* and *yone* occur, and all occurrences of the particles and responses are prototypical and straightforwardly predicted by the PFH.

### ***Data***

(From line 177 to line 205 in Appendix B)

- 1P: .hh bonsai ii      **yo ne**.  
      bonsai good    yo ne
- 2J: a    ii    desu **yo**:. =  
      yes good Cop    yo
- 3P: = iya ore mo **ne** (.) bonsai wa **ne** (.) jitsuwa (.) ussura  
      well I    too ne        bonsai Top ne        actually    slightly
- 4P: kyoomi    ga    [at]te,  
      interest S     have-and
- 5J:                    [a ]  
                      oh
- 6J: agemasu ka ø?  
      give        Q
- 7P: iya iranee        **yo**. =  
      no    don't-need yo
- 8J: = a (.) huh hah hah [(laughter)]  
      oh
- 9B:                                    [(laughter)] [(laughter)]
- 10P:                                    [da                    ] [tte sa:.,]  
                                      because                    IP
- 11J:    [hai.            ] hai.  
  yes                    yes
- 12P: (1.0) are    sugoi aato da **yo na**:.  
                  that very art    Cop yo na
- 13J: a hai. soo da to    omoimasu ø.  
      oh yes    so    Cop Comp think
- 14    (0.5)

15J: hai. =  
yes

16P: = are sa: (.) asoko no nakani,  
that IP over-there LK inside

17J: ee. =  
yes

18P: = sono kisetsu (.) toka omoi o [fu ]ujikometa,  
er season and-so-on thoughts O confined

19J: [hai.]  
Yes

20J: hai.  
yes

21P: mono:: ga an da yo [ne.]  
thing S exist-Nom Cop yo ne

22J: [ha ] [i.]  
yes

23P: [a ]no chicchaina, =  
that small

24J: = hai. =  
yes

25P: = bonsai no nakani na:: =  
bonsai LK inside na

26J: = hai.  
yes

27P: u:::n.  
right

28J: hai.  
yes

29P: n::de:: jibun no apiirupointo::,  
and self LK appealing point

(gloss)

1P: .hh Bonsai are cool yo ne.  
2J: Yes they are cool yo:: =  
3/4P: = Actually I'm a bit interested in bonsai too and,  
5/6J: Oh shall I give you some ø?  
7P: No I don't want any yo. =  
8J: = Oh. (.) (laughter)  
9B: (laughter)  
10P: Because,  
11J: Yes.  
12P: (1.0) bonsai are great art yo na:.  
13J: Oh yes. I think so ø.  
14 (0.5)  
15J: Yes. =  
16-21P: = You get things like the seasons, ideas and what have you incorporated into them yo ne.  
22J: Yes.

23-25P: Into those tiny bonsai **na::** =  
 26J: = Yes.  
 27P: Righ::t.  
 28J: Yes.  
 29P: A::nd your most appealing point is,

## *Analysis*

P tells J that *bonsai* are good, and uses *yone*:

1P: .hh bonsai ii **yo ne**.  
       bonsai good yo ne

2J: a ii desu **yo::** =  
       yes good Cop yo

1P: .hh Bonsai are cool **yo ne**.

2J: Yes, they are cool **yo::**=

P uses *yone* to show his expectation that J will accept that the figure emerging in the talk satisfies the criterion for having *yo* attached to it, and direct J's acceptance of this. This response is duly forthcoming. It seems from the following exchanges that he intends to show off his knowledge of *bonsai* to J and the overhearing audience, rather than intending only J to talk about them. That is to say, P's use of *yone*, which shows his orientation to the activity type, is tactical but unmarked. Reacting to the direct force of *yone* (i.e. *ne*) in P's utterance in line 1, J shows his acceptance with *yo* because he intends the figure emerging in the talk (i.e. *bonsai* are good) to be grounded and directs an assumptive response. It is difficult to tell whether he intends to react to the force of *yo* in his own utterance or he intends P to react to it because of P's latched utterance in which he starts talking about *bonsai*:

3P: = iya ore mo **ne** (.) bonsai wa **ne** (.) jitsuwa (.) ussura  
       well I too ne bonsai Top ne actually slightly

4P: kyoomi ga [at]te,  
       interest S have-and

3/4P: = Actually I'm a bit interested in bonsai too and,

It seems that P produces the proposition in lines 3-4, reacting to the implied force of his own use of *yo* in *yone* in line 1 rather than to the force of *yo* in J's utterance in line 2. That is to say, as mentioned above, P intended to talk about *bonsai* himself anyway so as to show off his knowledge of it to J and to the programme's overhearing audience. *Jitsu wa* (actually) probably shows his orientation to the exceptional nature of his contribution and thus justifies the argument that P introduces this topic for his own benefit. In this turn, P marks the information units *ore mo* (I also) and *bonsai wa* (*bonsai*) with utterance-internal *ne*, directing J's acceptance of each component part of the account he is gradually assembling. This is probably because he intends to emphasise that not only J but also he himself likes *bonsai*. At this point, J interrupts P and offers him some of his *bonsai*:

5J:                               [a ]  
                                      oh  
  
6J:   agemasu ka ø?  
      give       Q  
  
5/6J: Oh shall I give you some ø?

The first word *a* (oh) indicates that J did not expect to discover that P also liked *bonsai*. J marks his offer with *zero* since the utterance type, an offer, itself directs an acceptance or a refusal as a second pair-part. P refuses J's offer bluntly:

7P:   iya iranee       yo. =  
      no   don't-need yo  
  
7P:   No I don't want any yo. =

He uses *yo* because he intends his refusal to be ground for an assumptive response by either himself or J. The assumptive response to this *yo*-utterance is probably to make it explicit that it would be inappropriate for P to accept *bonsai* from a contestant such as J.

However, such a response is something J cannot produce without humiliating himself, as his response suggests:

8J: = a (.) huh hah hah [(laughter)]  
       oh  
 9B: [(laughter)] [(laughter)]  
 8J: = Oh. (.) (laughter)  
 9B: (laughter)

Latched to P's discourteous rejection, J says *a* (oh), indicating that P's blunt refusal is unexpected. Then, instead of producing a linguistically explicit assumptive response, J laughs, perhaps in order to hide his embarrassment. His laughter also acknowledges his mistake in making the offer. This discomfort-signalling laughter triggers in turn the laughter of somebody in the studio ('B' in the transcription). Overlapping the laughter of the person in the studio, P starts talking about *bonsai*, saying that *bonsai* are great art:

9B: [(laughter)] [(laughter)]  
 10P: [da               ] [tte sa:,]  
       because               IP  
 11J: [hai.           ] hai.  
       yes               yes  
 12P: (1.0) are sugoi aato da **yo na:**.  
       that very art Cop yo na  
 9B: (laughter)  
 10P: Because,  
 11J: Yes.  
 12P: (1.0) bonsai are great art **yo na:**.

At this point, he marks the proposition with *yona*. *Na* here can be considered as a variant of *ne*, which occurs exclusively in male casual speech when it occurs with *yo*. That is to say, P shows his expectation that J will accept that the figure emerging in the talk satisfies the criterion for having *yo* attached to it, and directs J's acceptance of this.

P uses *yona* here, like the first use of *yone* in this exchange, probably because he intends to continue showing off his knowledge of *bonsai* to J and to the overhearing audience after J's acceptance of the appropriateness of *yo*. J shows his acceptance, saying that he thinks the same:

13J: a hai. soo da to omoimasu 0.  
oh yes so Cop Comp think

14 (0.5)

15J: hai. =  
yes

13J: Oh yes. I think so 0.

14 (0.5)

15J: Yes. =

At this point, J uses *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded: he requires no particular response, probably because he thinks that P is going to react to the implied force of *yo* in *yona* in line 12. J's assertion is followed by 0.5 second pause, perhaps allowing time for P to come up with an appropriate assumptive response to the force of *yo* in his own *yona*-marked utterance in line 12. Then J says 'Yes', probably to fill the pause. In a latched utterance, reacting to the force of *yo* in his own *yona* utterance in line 12, P starts showing off his knowledge of *bonsai*, saying that people can feel seasons and ideas inside *bonsai*:

15J: hai. =  
yes

16P: = are sa: (.) asoko no nakani,  
that IP over-there LK inside

17J: ee. =  
yes

18P: = sono kisettsu (.) toka omoi o [fu ]ujikometa,  
er season and-so-on thoughts O confined

19J: [hai.]  
Yes

20J: hai.  
yes



21P: mono:: ga an                    da **yo** [**ne**.]  
       thing S exist-Nom Cop yo ne

15J:     Yes. =

16-21P: = You get things like the seasons, ideas and what have you incorporated into them **yo ne**.

At this point, he uses *yone*, intending to show his expectation that J will accept that the figure emerging in the talk satisfies the criterion for having *yo* attached to it, and directing his acceptance. Overlapping the end of P's assertion, J shows his acceptance of this; although J starts talking before he hears the *ne* in *yone* in line 21, he probably anticipates P's use of *ne* from the proposition contained in P's utterance in lines 16-21:

21P: mono:: ga an                    da **yo** [**ne**.]  
       thing S exist-Nom Cop yo ne

22J:                                    [ha ] [i.]  
                                       yes

23P:                                    [a ]no chicchaina, =  
                                       that small

24J: = hai. =  
       yes

25P: = bonsai no nakani **na**::. =  
       bonsai LK inside na

22J:     Yes.

23/25P: Into those tiny bonsai **na**::.

Then, overlapping the end of J's acceptance, P adds the elaborative afterthought 'into those tiny *bonsai*' (lines 23-25) to his previous assertion (lines 16-21), and uses *na*, a final particle with a similar force to *ne*, in seeking an acceptance, proposing that the figure emerging in the talk should be treated as a ground for the next proposition without further ado and also directing J's acceptance. J duly obliges, responding to the force of utterance-final *na*.

25J: = hai.  
       yes

25J: = Yes.

At this point, it seems that P expects J to react the implied force of *yo* in line 21, having nothing more to say about *bonsai* himself. This may be inferred from P's rather empty utterance *u:::n* (Righ:::t):

27P: *u:::n*.  
right

27P: Righ:::t.

J then says *hai* (Yes) which shows his lack of intention to develop the topic as well:

28J: *hai*.  
yes

28J: Yes.

P then moves on to a different topic, asking J what his most appealing point is:

29P: *n::de::: jibun no apiirupointo::,*  
and self LK appeal-point

29P: A::nd your most appealing point is,

### 5.3 Summary

In this chapter, we have examined a radio phone-in exchange in order to test whether or not the PFH is applicable to the particles used in a marked activity type. The examination has shown how the presenter, P, alternatively created positive and negative contexts; he established positive contexts by asking J about his occupation (Extract 1) and his hobby, i.e. *bonsai* (Extract 5), which are rather non-controversial topics, and by criticising J for not asking his girlfriend about her being with another man (Extract 2), and P created negative contexts by telling J that he was not a good talker (Extract 3) and also for his idea that girls who are easy to pick up are not normal (Extract 4). We argued

that P's linguistic strategy shows his orientation to the activity type in which he and J are engaged: P needed to observe what kind of a man J was in order to decide whether he would make an appropriate person to invite to the studio. He also needed to make the exchange entertaining for the overhearing audience.

We have also shown how the particles reveal P's linguistic strategy mentioned above: when P intended to create positive contexts, he tended both to use the particles and to respond to the utterances in which the particles occurred in predominantly expectable ways, as would be found in an unmarked talk type such as a casual conversation. However, as we found, he also made tactical use of some of these particles in showing orientation to the activity type in which he and J were engaged. In addition to such prototypical uses of the particles, we also have observed that when P intended to create negative contexts, he tended to use the particles and respond to the utterances in which the particles occurred in an atypical manner which would not be found in unmarked talk. However, we have argued that such atypical occurrences also showed his orientation to the activity type in which he and J were engaged and we have demonstrated that such phenomena could still be reconciled with the PFH when we adjust our expectation, not as to the functions of the particles, but as to the construction of (marked) talk.

The examination has also shown how the caller, J, tries to make a good impression on P during the interview in order to secure an invitation to the studio in Tokyo: when P's propositions are advantageous to J, he shows his agreement and tries to develop them. Even when P's propositions are disadvantageous to J, J does not or cannot show overt disagreement and struggles to avoid any conflict with P while at the same time trying to save his own face. Such strategies are a clear orientation to the

activity type in which he and P are engaged. However, his course of action makes him foolish, and this feebleness stimulates P increasingly to tease J, making the exchange entertaining to the overhearing audience as a result. P revealed in the programme a few weeks later that J had been successful in winning the right to go to the studio in Tokyo.

One noticeable fact is that *ne* occurs proportionally less frequently and *yo* more frequently in the marked talk type examined in this chapter than in the unmarked talk type examined in Chapter Four. The PFH is also able to account for this phenomenon, at least indirectly. *Ne* is expected to occur proportionally more frequently in an unmarked talk type where the participants do not have specific goals than in a marked talk type where the participants do have specific goals. This is because *ne* functions as an acceptance seeking particle which is important in building up and maintaining rapport between speakers. *Yo* occurs proportionally more frequently in a marked talk type since *yo*, whose function is to direct an assumptive response to the proposition contained in the *yo*-utterance, is more useful as a device to manage the flow of talk when a speaker wishes to achieve particular communicative goals.

The main purpose of this chapter and of the previous chapter was to test the PFH proposed in Chapter Two against natural occurring talk-in-interaction data. We have examined two different kinds of talk-in-interaction, unmarked and marked, so as to test the extent to which the PFH holds across different types of talk-in-interaction. The results of the analyses presented in these chapters strengthen the validity of the PFH and show that the new proposal to explain sentence-final particle function which was originally made on the basis of the study of the previous literature and supported by decontextualized examples does indeed explain the uses of a phenomenon particularly resistant to analysis.

## CHAPTER 6

### THE PARTICLES IN NATIVE/NON-NATIVE TALK-IN-INTERACTION

#### 6.1 Introduction

In Chapters Four and Five, we demonstrated the validity of the PFH with two different talk-in-interaction types which both occurred between Japanese native speakers (NSs): an instance of ‘small talk’ involving two female native Japanese speakers, which was regarded as an unmarked talk type, and a radio phone-in exchange involving a caller and a host, both male, which was regarded as a marked talk type. That is to say, we examined the ways NSs use and respond to the particles *ne*, *yo* and *yone* and to *zero*. This examination showed that, as we hypothesised in the PFH proposed in Chapter Two, the particles have not only pragmatic properties but also sequential properties: the NSs in the talk-in-interaction analysed used the particles relatively conventionally in some places and relatively strategically in other places, signalling to their interlocutors how they intended their utterances to be responded to. The examination also showed that these meta-functions play a crucial role in enabling Japanese interlocutors to understand the pragmatic and sequential properties of each other’s contributions to talk. These examinations of the particles in terms of their pragmatic and sequential functions were only made possible by employing the PFH, a hypothesis which provides a clear explanation of the function of the particles in talk-in-interaction, unlike the hypotheses

previously proposed by other researchers.

In order to achieve the second purpose of the present research, i.e. to explain the ‘awkwardness’ NSs feel in interacting with NNSs in relation to particle use, in this chapter, we will move to a more challenging examination: the study of how the particles occur in Japanese talk-in-interaction involving a NS and a non-native speaker (NNS). To achieve this, as in the two previous chapters, this chapter will also employ a qualitative approach since realizing the second purpose of the investigation also requires a close examination of the ways in which a verbal exchange between a NS and a NNS develops on a turn-by-turn basis in a particular context.

This chapter will focus especially on two aspects; firstly, it will focus on how the NNS uses the particles and responds to the utterances in which the particles occur in terms of expectability. The decisive factor in deciding what is ‘expected’ and what is ‘unexpected’ is the PFH, whose validity was demonstrated with two different types of talk-in-interaction involving NSs in the previous chapters. Secondly, this chapter will focus on whether and how the NNS linguistic behaviour which is not accordance with the PFH (i.e. any unexpectedness in the NNS’s particle use or response to utterances in which the particles occur) causes the NS problems.

## **6.2 Native and non-native talk-in-interaction**

As the opportunities for people of different cultural backgrounds to meet have been increasing exponentially in recent decades, the number of studies of *intercultural* or *interethnic communication* has been also rapidly increased. Putting their emphasis on the notion of culture, broadly speaking, researchers into intercultural communication are interested either in examining how different values or communicative strategies/styles

between participants from different cultures cause misunderstanding or communication difficulties (Clyne, 1994; Gumperz, 1982; Scollon and Scollon, 2001, etc.), or in examining how cultural differences between the participants are actually shown in interaction, in other words, how the participants 'do cultural differences' within interaction (Blommaert, 1991; Nishizawa, 1995, 1999, etc.), or in 'foreigner talk' (cf. Ferguson, 1971; Gass and Selinker, 1983; Wesche and Ready, 1985) i.e. how native speakers simplify or accommodate their way of speaking in interaction with non-native speakers (Cohen and Cooper, 1986; Ravid, Olshtain and Ze'elon, 2003, etc.).<sup>1</sup>

The talk-in-interaction which will be examined in this chapter can also be considered as an instance of intercultural communication since it occurs between a Japanese national and an English national. However, this chapter may slightly differ from what researchers of intercultural communication generally aim to achieve in examining how differences are reconciled between the speakers whose cultures are different: this chapter does not focus on the cultural differences between two speakers. Rather its interest is on a NNS's unexpected linguistic behaviour in relation to the particles, and its influence on a NS. Whether unexpectedness in NNS talk results from pragmalinguistic competence or socio-pragmatic competence is less important in this chapter, and indeed it is hardly possible for these to be considered separately in any consideration of particle use.

---

<sup>1</sup> The researcher is also aware of studies of cross-cultural communication differences which might also be thought to imply difficulties in intercultural communication (cf. Blum-Kulka, 1997; Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper, 1989; Kasper and Blum-Kulka, 1993, etc.).

### **6.2.1 Data**

The data analysed in this chapter are a 6 minute-extract from a 74-minute exchange between a female NS and a male NNS who were asked to record a casual conversation. The conversation, in which the participants mainly talk about their experience of life in Japan, was recorded in December 2002. The NNS's first language is British English and his Japanese speaking ability is very high; he had been studying the language for several years and had returned from a year studying Japanese in the northern city of Sendai in the summer of 2002. Shortly after these data were obtained he won the first prize in the student category of the Sir Peter Parker Japanese Speech Contest Awards held in London in February in 2003. The native speaker, who lives in Tokyo, came to the U.K. in the summer of 2002 as a one-year exchange student. The conversation occurred when the NS (hereafter W for 'woman') visited the NNS (hereafter M for 'man') in his student study-bedroom. As with the data considered in Chapter Four, at the time of the recording, neither of the speakers was aware of the researcher's area of investigation, although they were aware that their conversation was being recorded.

### **6.2.2 Analysis**

The analysis will examine how M uses particles and also he responds to utterances in which particles occur in nineteen extracts drawn from the talk-in-interaction data mentioned above.

In the first place (6.2.2.1), we will examine the eleven extracts in which M either uses or would be expected to use particles. Of the eleven extracts to be considered, three



show expectable<sup>2</sup> uses of *ne* (utterance-final *ne*, utterance-internal *ne*, and *ne* attached to a nominalized structure), two show the absence of utterance-final *ne* where it might be considered expected, three show the absence of *yo* in contexts where it might be expected, one shows his expectable use of *yone*, one shows the absence of *yone* and one shows the absence of *ne*, *yo* or *yone* in a situation where any of the the particles might be expected. What is interesting is that *zero* is never replaced unexpectedly by a particle and is always the default where an expectable use of *ne*, *yo* or *yone* fails to materialize. This phenomenon clearly indicates that M does not choose *zero* among the others purposely, but rather that he fails to use the other particles, resulting in repeated unexpected uses of *zero*.

Secondly (6.2.2.2), we will examine M's response to utterances in which the particles occur in eight extracts. In these eight extracts, there are eight occasions on which M is called on respond to W's use of a particle. In one instance M shows an expectable response to utterance-final *ne*, in one he shows expectable responses to utterance-internal *ne* and to *ne* attached to the nominalized structure in W's utterance, in two he shows his potential failure to respond to *ne* (utterance-internal *ne* and utterance-final *ne*) in an expectable way, in one he shows an expectable response to an utterance in which *yo* occurs, in two he shows potential failure to respond to *yo* in an expectable way, and finally in one he shows his potential failure to respond to *yo* in his own utterance in an expectable way.

As in the previous chapter, in considering each extract we will first present a

---

<sup>2</sup> In this chapter, the words 'expectable', 'expected', 'unexpected' and 'unexpectedable' are often used. These words entail not only the ability to use the particles in particular contexts in appropriate ways, but also the ability to use the particles in ways that will be recognized as valid by the members of the target speech community (Yoshimi, 1999: 1514).

synopsis of the exchange and then move to an analysis of each focused instance.

### 6.2.2.1 Use of particles

#### 6.2.2.1.1 Extract 1 - Expectable use of utterance-final *ne*

##### *Synopsis: content*

In this part of the exchange, having claimed that supermarkets are better than convenience stores, W says that there is a supermarket near her house. M then says that this is ideal.

##### *Synopsis: NNS's particle use*

In this part of the exchange, M uses utterance-final *ne* twice in expectable ways.

##### *Data*

(From line 91 to line 107 in Appendix C)

1W: iya konbini                      tte betsuni                      sa:: sugoi yasui wake demo nai  
no convenience-store Top particularly IP    very cheap Nom even Neg

2W: shi: nanka                      onaji okashi o konbini                      de kau no to  
and something same snack O convenience-store at buy Nom and

3W: itooyookadoo de kau no to dattara                      sa: akirakani itooyookadoo no  
Itooyookadoo at buy Nom and Cop-Conditional IP clearly Itooyookadoo Nom

4W: hoo ga yasui ja:n[:: ø.]  
side S cheap Tag

5M:                                      [u::n.] soryaa    soo [da ] ø.  
yes                      that-Top so    Cop

6W:    [(de)] sukunai okozukai de  
and little money with

7W: doredake ooku kaoo ka to omottara sa:: itooyookadoo  
how-much many buy-Volitional Q Comp think-Conditional IP Itooyookadoo

8W: ni ashi ga muteshimau n da yo. dakara konbini ikanakatta ø.  
to foot S direct Nom Cop yo therefore convenience-store didn't-go

9 (.)

10W: ( [ ] ) ni atta [shi ø.]  
at existed because

11M: [un. ] [de ] mo itooyookadoo tooi jan ø.  
uh-huh but Itooyookadoo far Tag

12W: huh huh uchi wa chikai no[::: ø. hah hah hah ]  
house Top near Nom

13M: [a::::: sore] wa sore wa  
that Top that Top

14M: ichiban da **ne**.  
best Cop ne

15W: SOO ø. =  
so

16M: = sore ga ichiban risoo da **ne**.  
that S best ideal Cop ne

17W: SOO ø.  
so

(gloss)

1-4W: Convenience stores are not especially cheap and it's clear that you can buy the same snack more cheaply at Itooyookadoo than convenience stores, isn't it ø?

5M: Yea::h. That's right ø.

6-8W: And considering how much snacks I can buy with a little amount of money makes me to choose Itooyookadoo yo. So I didn't go to convenience stores ø.

9 (.)

10W: Because there was Itooyookadoo in (somewhere ø).

11M: Uh-huh. But Itooyookadoo is far, isn't it ø?

12W: (laughter) My house is close to Itooyookadoo ø. (laughter)

13/14M: A::::: that's that's best then **ne**.

15W: That's right ø. =

16M: = That's ideal **ne**.

17W: That's right ø.

## Analysis

In lines 1-10, W compares convenience stores with *Itooyookadoo*, one of the biggest supermarket chains in Japan, saying that the same snack can be bought more

cheaply at the latter than the former. M then produces the proposition that *Itooyookadoo* is far away, followed by a tag question inviting confirmation. Although he may not have intended this utterance to be humorous, this utterance is considered comical by W, given that he and W live in different parts of Japan; it can be inferred from his utterance that the *Itooyookadoo* in the town in which he lived was far from his house. It is, however, obvious that M does not know whether the *Itooyookadoo* in the town in which W lived was near her house or not.

1W: iya konbini                      tte betsuni                      sa:: sugoi yasui wake demo nai  
no convenience-store Top particularly IP    very cheap Nom even Neg

2W: shi: nanka                      onaji okashi o konbini                      de kau no to  
and something same snack O convenience-store at buy Nom and

3W: itooyookadoo de kau no to dattara                      sa: akirakani itooyookadoo no  
Itooyookadoo at buy Nom and Cop-Conditional IP clearly Itooyookadoo Nom

4W: hoo ga yasui ja:n[:: ø.]  
side S cheap Tag

5M:                                      [u::n.] soryaa soo [da ] ø.  
yes that-Top so Cop

6W:    [(de)] sukunai okozukai de  
and little money with

7W: doredake ooku kaoo                      ka to omottara                      sa:: itooyookadoo  
how-much many buy-Volitional Q Comp think-Conditional IP Itooyookadoo

8W: ni ashi ga muteshimau n da yo. dakara konbini                      ikanakatta ø.  
to foot S direct Nom Cop yo therefore convenience-store didn't-go

9 (.)

10W: ( [ ] ) ni atta [shi ø.]  
at existed because

11M: [un. ]                                      [de ]mo itooyookadoo tooi jan ø.  
uh-huh but Itooyookadoo far Tag

1-4W: Convenience stores are not especially cheap and it's clear that you can buy the same snack more cheaply at Itooyookadoo than convenience stores, isn't it ø?

5M: Yea::h. That's right ø.

6-8W: And considering how much snacks I can buy with a little amount of money makes me to choose Itooyookadoo yo. So I didn't go to convenience stores ø.

9 (.)

10W: Because there was Itooyookadoo in (somewhere ø).

11M: Uh-huh. But Itooyookadoo is far, isn't it ø?

W's laughter (huh huh) following M's comical utterance in line 11 indicates that she thinks that M's utterance is unexpected and humorous. She subsequently says that the *Itooyookadoo* in her town is near her house.

12W: huh huh uchi wa chikai no[:: Ø. hah hah hah ]  
house Top near Nom

12W: (laughter) My house is close to Itooyookadoo ø. (laughter)

She marks this utterance with *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded: she requires no particular response from M since she intends her utterance to be no more than a response to the unexpected proposition contained in M's utterance. Her laughter continues after her utterance.

Overlapping the end of W's utterance and her laughter in line 12, M says that it is best to have the supermarket nearby:

13M:                   [a::: sore] wa sore wa  
                               that Top that Top

14M: ichiban da ne.  
best Cop ne

13/14M: A::::: that's that's best then ne.

At this point, he uses *ne* expectably, which signals his intention that the figure emerging in the talk should be grounded for the next proposition without further ado and directs W's acceptance of this.

W behaves as one might expect, and shows her acceptance with *so* (That's right), uttered more loudly than the surrounding talk:

15W: 500 ø. =  
50

15W: That's right  $\emptyset.$  =

At this point, she uses *zero*. One may claim that *ne* would be more expectable than *zero*

here. This is because it is conventional that when the speaker agrees to the addressee's opinion, he marks his agreement with *ne* so as to intensify their rapport (see p.36). Why then does W use *zero* here rather than *ne*? We can possibly claim that she intends to maintain her rapport with him differently: she does so not with *ne* but with loudness. That is to say, she tries to intensify her agreement making by her utterance louder than the surrounding talk.

Having received W's strong agreement, M rephrases what he has said in lines 13-14, saying that having the supermarket near your house is ideal; he adds the word *ichiban* (best) to ideal here. W's strong agreement in line 15 may have impelled M to repeat the same proposition to maximize their rapport:

16M: = sore ga ichiban risoo da **ne**.  
           that S   best       ideal Cop ne

16M: = That's ideal **ne**.

He again expectably marks his utterance with *ne*, seeking for W's acceptance of the figure emerging in his talk to be grounded without further ado.

Reacting to the force of *ne* in M's utterance, W again shows her strong acceptance with louder voice, as she has done in line 15:

17W: SOO ø.  
       so

17W: That's right ø.

\*\*\*\*\*

The extract examined above shows M's ability to use utterance-final *ne* in expectable ways: by marking an utterance whose proposition is readily acceptable with

*ne*, he intensifies his rapport with W. This use of *ne*, which is an agreement seeker rather than a confirmation seeker, is probably easy for English native speakers to acquire since the use is quite similar to the English tag question. That is to say, ‘having the supermarket nearby is ideal *ne*’ can be translated as ‘having the supermarket nearby is ideal, isn’t it?’. Japanese *ne* and English tag questions both follow propositions that the addressee is expected to find acceptable.

#### 6.2.2.1.2 Extract 2- Expectable use of utterance-internal *ne*

##### *Synopsis: content*

In this part of the exchange, M explains that he would buy a new pack of *natto* (fermented soybeans) if a Lawson convenience store were near his apartment.

##### *Synopsis: NNS’s particle use*

In this part of the exchange, M uses utterance-internal *ne* in an expectable way.

##### *Data*

(From line 18 to line 19 in Appendix C)

1M: sugu soko ni rooson ga areba                      **ne** (.) betsunī atarashii  
       just there at Lawson S exist-Conditional ne        easily new

2M: no kaeru shi ø.  
       one can-buy because

(gloss)

1/2M: If there were a Lawson (near here) **ne** (.) we could buy new one ø.

## Analysis

In the talk leading up to this episode, M and W have been discussing the stale *natto* on the table in the room where the conversation is taking place. The extract examined here begins with M's utterance below:

1M: sugu soko ni rooson ga areba                    **ne** (.) betsun i atarashii  
     just there at Lawson S exist-Conditional ne       easily new

2M: no kaeru shi ø.  
     one can-buy because

1/2M: If there were a Lawson (near here) **ne** (.) we could buy new one ø.

In lines 1-2, he says that they could buy a new pack of *natto* if there were a Lawson near the hall of residence in which he lives. In the utterance, he uses utterance-internal *ne*, and will then produce the main clause immediately following the protasis. As discussed in 2.3.3.5, utterance-internal *ne* marks not utterances but information units of utterances: it is hypothesized that, by using utterance-internal *ne*, the speaker proposes that the information unit marked with *ne* should be treated as a ground for one or more upcoming lexical units and directs the addressee's acceptance of each component part. That is to say, M intends the conditional clause to be treated as a ground by W for the upcoming proposition that they could buy a new pack of *natto*. Another possibility is that the short pause after the conditional clause allows M processing time to formulate a new proposition, and therefore indicates his 'non-native speaker-ness'. Yet another possibility is that it shows that he is waiting for either *aizuchi* or uptake.

W fails to show her acceptance immediately. This is probably because the proposition contained in the conditional clause is unexpected since she does not expect M to refer to Lawson in this context and she does not know how he is going to connect Lawson to the ongoing topic of the *natto*.



To summarize, M marked the conditional clause with *ne*, intending it to be utterance-internal. However, because the proposition contained in the conditional clause to which *ne* is attached was not obviously related to what had gone before, W failed to encourage M's confirmation with *aizuchi*. Although the proposition contained in the conditional clause confused W, M's use of *ne* in line 1 can nevertheless be considered expectable.

\*\*\*\*\*

Having examined M's expectable use of utterance-final and utterance-internal *ne*, we will now examine a use of *ne* attached to a nominalized structure.

#### 6.2.2.1.3 Extract 3 - Expectable use of *ne* attached to a nominalized structure

##### *Synopsis: content*

In this part of the exchange, M talks about a habit he has developed in Japan.

##### *Synopsis: NNS's particle use*

In this part of the exchange, M attaches *ne* to a nominalized structure on three occasions, on each in an expectable way.

##### *Data*

(From line 56 to line 76 in Appendix C)

1M: = de   nanka           (.) sugoi kuseninatta   no   wa (1.0) yoru   no  
           and something       very   became-a-habit Nom Top       night LK



(gloss)

- 1/2M: = and er (.) what has become rather a habit is (1.0) at 10 o'clock at night,  
3W: Uh-huh.  
4M: (1.8) Er coming back from the school club and,  
5W: Uh-huh.  
6M: (0.5) er:: a:nd (.) er finishing homework and, =  
7W: = Uh-huh. =  
8M: = at around ten o'clock,  
9W: Uh-huh.  
10M: (.) I get hungry **no ne**.  
11W: We do **ne**.  
12M: So very,  
13W: Oh, I don't (get hungry) yo. Sorry ø. (laughter)  
14/15M: Don't you ø? I do **no ne**.  
16W: Uh-huh. =  
17M: = and (2.8) because a Lawson is near (my house),  
18W: Uh-huh.  
19M: and a Seven-Eleven is also near **no ne**. =  
20W: = Uh-huh.  
21M: But (.) the Lawson is more er::, =

### *Analysis*

In lines 1-10, M says that he became hungry around at ten o'clock after coming back from a college sports club and then finishing his homework:

- 1M: = de nanka (.) sugoi kuseninatt no wa (1.0) yoru no  
and something very became-a-habit Nom Top night LK
- 2M: juuji gurai ni::,  
ten-o'clock around at
- 3W: un.  
uh-huh
- 4M: (1.8) nanka koo bukatsu kara kaettekite,  
something er school-club from returned-and
- 5W: un.  
uh-huh
- 6M: (0.5) a:: sorede: (.) nanka shukudai toka yatte, =  
and something homework and-so-on did-and
- 7W: = un. =  
uh-huh
- 8M: = demo juuji goro ni,  
but ten-o'clock around at
- 9W: un.  
uh-huh

10M: (.) pekepekoninan **no ne**.  
 become-hungry Nom ne

1/2M: = and er (.) what has become rather a habit is (1.0) at 10 o'clock at night,  
 3W: Uh-huh.  
 4M: (1.8) Er coming back from the school club and,  
 5W: Uh-huh.  
 6M: (0.5) er:: a:nd (.) er finishing homework and, =  
 7W: = Uh-huh. =  
 8M: = at around ten o'clock,  
 9W: Uh-huh.  
 10M: (.) I get hungry **no ne**.

In line 10, M attaches *ne* to a nominalized structure. As discussed in 4.2.2.4, *ne* is attached to a nominalized structure when the speaker intends to direct the addressee's acceptance of the proposition contained in the structure as a ground for the next proposition in the sequence. That is to say, M intends to produce a new proposition on the basis of the proposition contained in lines 1-10.

Reacting to the force of *ne* attached to the nominalized structure, W could have merely produced *aizuchi* here. W shows her acceptance, however, by agreeing to what M has said in line 10 (i.e. he becomes hungry). The reason why she shows her overt agreement to what M has said rather than encouraging him to continue with *aizuchi* is probably to strengthen her rapport with him:

11W: naru ne.  
 become ne

11W: We do ne.

At this point, she uses *ne*, proposing that her acceptance should be grounded without further ado and also directing M's acceptance: as mentioned earlier (p.36), it is conventional for the addressee in the next turn to use *ne* to mark acceptance of the original speaker's opinion as grounded without further ado, so as to strengthen rapport with him. In such a case, *ne* has the little if any sequential force and functions more like the second

pair-part in an adjacency pair.

M then starts adding a new proposition to the proposition contained in his previous utterances in lines 1-10, with *dakara sugoi* (So very):

12M: dakara      sugo[i,]  
          therefore very

12M: So very,

The first word *dakara* (therefore) clearly indicates his intention to develop what he has said in lines 1-10.

Interrupting M's utterance, W corrects her previous utterance in line 11, saying that she does not become hungry:

13W:                    [a ] naranai          yo. gomen ø. huh huh huh [huh huh                    ]  
                              don't-become yo    sorry

13W:                    Oh, I don't (get hungry) yo. Sorry ø. (laughter)

She marks her correction with *yo*, intending the figure emerging in the talk to be grounded in the expectation that it is either new to M or even controversial and also directs an assumptive response to the proposition. Subsequently, she apologizes to M for her insincere expression of agreement in line 11, with *gomen* (sorry). Her apology here can be considered as an assumptive response. This apology is marked with *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded: she does not intend her apology to be developed further. Her apology is followed by laughter. This laughter probably indicates that she had done something unconventional in changing her opinion so quickly.

Overlapping W's laughter, M shows his recognition of W's correction with *nannai no?* (Don't you?), and repeats the proposition that he becomes hungry:

14M: [nannai no ø?]  
don't-become Nom

15M: ore wa nan **no ne**.  
I Top become Nom ne

14/15M: Don't you ø? I do **no ne**.

At this point, he again attaches *ne* to the nominalized structure, intending to direct the addressee's acceptance of the proposition contained in the structure as a ground for the next proposition in the sequence. That is to say, he tries to repair the flow of the conversation interrupted by W in line 13 so as to continue his account.

W's following *aizuchi u::n* (uh-huh) indicates her understanding of his intention to continue his account:

16W: u::n.=  
uh-huh

16M: Uh-huh. =

M behaves as one might expect, and produces a new proposition, saying 'Because a Lawson is near' and adding that a Seven-Eleven is also near:

17M: = de (2.8) rooson chikai kara,  
and Lawson near because

18W: un.  
uh-huh

19M: de sebunirebun mo chikai **no ne**. =  
and Seven-Eleven also near Nom ne

17M: = and (2.8) because a Lawson is near (my house),

18W: Uh-huh.

19M: and a Seven-Eleven is also near **no ne**. =

The first word *de* (and) can be considered as his orientation to the nominalized structure in his own utterance in line 15. The long pause after *de* indicates processing time as he searches for a new proposition. At the end of the utterance (line 19), he again attaches *ne*

to the nominalized structure, intending to direct the addressee's acceptance of the proposition contained in the structure as a ground for the next proposition in the sequence.

M's utterance is followed by W's *aizuchi*, which again indicates her understanding of his intention to produce a new proposition:

20W: = u[n.]  
uh-huh

20W: = Uh-huh.

Overlapping the end of W's *aizuchi*, M continues, saying that 'But (.) the Lawson is more er::':

21M: [de]mo (.) rooson no hoo ga nanka koo::, =  
but Lawson LK side S something er

21M: But (.) the Lawson is more er::, =

\*\*\*\*\*

In the three extracts considered above, we examined M's expectable uses of utterance-final *ne*, utterance-internal *ne*, and *ne* attached to the nominalized structure. We can argue from this analysis that M exercises *ne* in a native-like way.

It seems, however, that there is something more for him to acquire to be a more competent user of the particle: the two following extracts will show cases in which M uses *zero* at a point where *ne* would be more expectable.





(gloss)

1-4W: Convenience stores are not especially cheap and obviously you can buy the same snack more cheaply at Itooyookadoo than convenience stores, yes ø?

5M: Yea::h. That's right ø. =

6-8W: And considering how much snacks I can buy with a little amount of money makes me to choose Itooyookadoo yo. So I didn't go to convenience stores ø.

### ***Analysis***

In the sequence which precedes the extract examined here, by way of a response to W's utterance that she hardly goes to convenience stores, M says that he likes them very much. In lines 1-4, she explains why she hardly ever goes to convenience stores, probably because she feels obliged to provide an explanation. Comparing convenience stores with *Itooyookadoo*, one of the biggest franchise supermarkets in Japan, she says that the same snacks can be bought more cheaply at supermarkets than convenience stores:

1W: iya konbini                      tte betsuni                      sa:: sugoi yasui wake demo nai  
no convenience-store Top particularly IP very cheap Nom even Neg

2W: shi: nanka                      onaji okashi o konbini                      de kau no to  
and something same snack O convenience-store at buy Nom and

3W: itooyookadoo de kau no to dattara sa: akirakani itooyookadoo no  
Itooyookadoo at buy Nom and Cop-Cond IP clearly Itooyookadoo Nom

4W: hoo ga yasui ja:n[:: ø.]  
side S cheap Tag

1-4W: Convenience stores are not especially cheap and obviously you can buy the same snack more cheaply at Itooyookadoo than convenience stores, yes ø?

At this point, she uses *zero* because she adds the tag-like expression *jan* to the end of the utterance.

Reacting to the force of W's use of the tag, M shows his agreement in the following turn:

5M: [u::n.] soryaa soo da ø. =  
yes that-Top so Cop

5M: Yea::h. That's right ø. =

This utterance sounds blunt, however, because of his use of *zero*, which indicates that M requires no particular response to his agreement. As mentioned before, it is conventionally expected for the speaker to mark his agreement with *ne* in this sort of situation, thus intensifying his rapport with her.<sup>3</sup>

In a latched utterance, W continues comparing the supermarket with convenience stores, stating that she chooses supermarkets because she can buy more snacks at *Itooyookadoo* than convenience stores for the same money:

6W: [(de)] sukunai okozukai de  
and little money with

7W: doredake ooku kaoo ka to omottara sa:: itooyookadoo  
how-much many buy-Volitional Q Comp think-Conditional IP Itooyookadoo

8W: ni ashi ga muteshimau n da yo. dakara konbini ikanakatta ø.  
to foot S direct Nom Cop yo therefore convenience-store did-not-go

6-8W: And considering how much snacks I can buy with a little amount of money makes me to choose Itooyookadoo yo. So I didn't go to convenience stores ø.

What is important here is that M's failure to use *ne* (i.e. M's unexpected use of *zero*) does not seem to affect how W constructs the next turn. This is because *ne*, which should have occurred here, functions as an affective marker to strengthen M's rapport with W rather than as a sequential instruction marker indicating how to respond in the next turn.

The next extract will also show a situation in which M uses *zero* at the point where

---

<sup>3</sup> M also fails to use *ne* in the same kind of situation in the next extract. If he always fails to use *ne* in these situations, his failure could be argued to be pragmalinguistic. That is to say, although he probably knows that it is necessary to maintain rapport, he does not know that he is not doing this appropriately: the use of *ne* here might be counter-intuitive to NNSs since it does not have quite the same function as the speaker's ground-seeking *ne* in the first pair-part of the adjacency pair.

*ne* would be more expectable, this time with consequences for W's continuation.

#### 6.2.2.1.5 Extract 5 - Failure to use *ne* (2)

##### *Synopsis: content*

In this part of the exchange, W tries to obtain M's sympathy for the fact that commuting to her university in Japan is hard.

##### *Synopsis: NNS's particle use*

As in the previous exchange in 6.2.2.1.4, in this part of the exchange, M uses *zero* at a place where *ne* would be more expectable.

##### *Data*

(From line 139 to line 143 in Appendix C)

1W: shiia made sanjuppun na n da yo aruku to.  
Shiia until thirty-minutes Cop Nom Cop yo walk if

2M: honto ø.  
true

3W: tooku nai ø?  
far Neg

4M: tooi ø. =  
far

5W: = tamani arukitai hi mo aru kedo sa.  
sometimes want-to-walk day also exist although IP

(gloss)

1W: It takes thirty minutes to Shiia yo - if I walk.

2M: Really ø.

3W: It's far, no ø?

4M: It's far ø. =

5W: = Sometimes I feel like walking though.

## *Analysis*

In the talk leading up to this episode, M and W are proudly telling each other how hard their commuting to their universities is. In this part of the exchange, W tells M how hard commuting to the university was for her: she says that it takes thirty minutes from her house to *Shiia*, marking this assertion with *yo*<sup>4</sup>:

1W: shiia made sanjuppun na n da yo aruku to.  
Shiia until thirty-minutes Cop Nom Cop yo walk if

1W: It takes thirty minutes to Shiia yo - if I walk.

This utterance is followed by M's confirming use of *honto* (Really):

2M: honto ø.  
true

2M: Really ø.

At this point, he uses *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded: he requires no particular response from W.

W then asks for his agreement to the proposition that the thirty-minute walk is a long way with a negative tag question:

3W: tooku nai ø?  
far Neg

3W: It's far, no ø?

W's invitation is followed by M's response *tooi* (far):

4M: tooi ø. =  
far

4M: It's far ø. =

---

<sup>4</sup> W's use of *yo* at this point and M's response to it will be examined in 6.2.2.2.7.

He marks this utterance with *zero* which sounds very blunt since *zero* indicates that he requires no response from W. In other words, his use of *zero* represents him as indifferent to what she has just said. At this point, *ne* would be more expectable than *zero* because, as mentioned before, it is conventional that the speaker adds *ne* when agreeing with the addressee's opinion, thereby maintaining rapport with her.<sup>5</sup>

Unlike what occurs in the previous extract examined in 6.2.2.1.4, what is interesting here is that M's failure to use *ne* in line 4 seems to affect how W constructs the next turn: having received what appears to be a blunt response caused partly by the unexpected absence of *ne*, W may have thought that M considered her to be a lazy person who does not like walking: she responds concessively (*kedo*), saying that she feels like walking sometimes, probably so as to save face:

5W: = tamani      arukitai      hi mo      aru      kedo      sa.  
                  sometimes want-to-walk day also exist although IP

5W: = Sometimes I feel like walking though.

\*\*\*\*\*

The two extracts examined in 6.2.2.1.4 and 6.2.2.1.5 showed cases where M uses *zero* at a point where *ne* would be more expectable. He fails to use *ne*, and thus fails to follow the conventions of Japanese talk-in-interaction that a speaker adds *ne* to his agreement with the addressee's opinion. His failure may result from the fact that his native language, English, does not have such a convention: in English a speaker can use a

---

<sup>5</sup> The possibility that M intentionally chooses to use *zero* here so as to represent himself as indifferent to W's utterance cannot be wholly denied. That is to say, strictly, his use of *zero* marks a *potential* failure to use *ne*. However, whether his use of *zero* is intentional or unintentional does not matter so much in this thesis. The fact that his use of *zero* here is unexpected and the consequence of such unexpectedness are more important.

*zero*-utterance and still be taken to be shown agreement with the addressee's opinion.

Having examined M's use of *ne* in the above five extracts, we can probably argue that although there is more he needs to learn, he is, on the whole, fairly competent in the use of the particle, being able to use utterance-final *ne*, utterance-internal *ne*, and *ne* attached to a nominalized structure expectably in most cases.

We will now move to the examination on the particle *yo*. In the six-minute talk data selected for analysis in the present chapter, M uses *yo* just once. Although the frequency of the occurrence of particles is not our concern in this study, a single occurrence may be considered unusual, especially given that W uses *yo* seven times in the same interaction. The following three extracts will reveal that M has a strong tendency to use *zero* in places where *yo* would be more expectable.

#### **6.2.2.1.6 Extract 6 - Failure to use *yo* (1)**

##### ***Synopsis: content***

This part of the exchange immediately follows Extract 2 where M says that if there was a Lawson near his place, he could buy a new pack of *natto*. The exchange begins with W asking M why he likes Lawson so much and whether there were many Lawsons in the city he lived in. M confirms that there were several Lawsons in the city, which leads W to start talking about convenience stores in her city.

##### ***Synopsis: NNS's particle use***

In this part of the exchange, M uses *zero* at a point where *yo* would be more expectable.

## Data

(From line 20 to line 27 in Appendix C)

1W: nande rooson sonnani                      suki na    no ø?  
      why    Lawson to-that-extent like Cop Nom

2M: rooson ga::,  
      Lawson S

3W: sendai ookatta    no ø?  
      Sendai were-many Nom

4M: sungoi ooi    (no) ø.  
      very    many    Nom

5    (.)

6M: ho[ntoni ø.]  
      honestly

7W:    [fu::    ]:n. ko- chihoo ga ooi    no- nanka            saikin    saikin  
      right                      local S    many Nom something recently recently

8W: dekihajimeta                      kedo    ne:.  
      started-to-be-built though ne

(gloss)

1W:    Why do you like Lawson so much ø?  
3W:    Were there many Lawson in Sendai ø?  
2-4M: There are many Lawson (in Sendai) ø.  
5    (.)  
6M:    Honestly ø.  
7/8W: Ri:::ght. Many (Lawsons) are in local areas- er they have started being built (in my hometown) though ne:.

## Analysis

Having heard M saying that he could buy a new pack of *natto* if there was a Lawson near his place, in line 1 W asks M why he likes the convenience store so much:

1W: nande rooson sonnani                      suki na    no ø?  
      why    Lawson to-that-extent like Cop Nom

1W: Why do you like Lawson so much ø?

She marks the question with *zero* since the utterance type, a question, requires a matching second pair-part in the form of an answer.

2M: rooson ga::,  
 Lawson S

3W: sendai ookatta no ø?  
 Sendai were-many Nom

4M: sungoi ooi (no) ø.  
 very many Nom

5 (.)

3W: Were there many Lawson in Sendai ø?  
 2-4M: There are many Lawson (in Sendai) ø.  
 5 (.)

In line 2, M starts answering W's wh-question. However, interrupting his utterance, W presents him with a potential answer, asking whether or not there are many Lawsons in Sendai City, where he lived. This utterance is also marked with *zero* because, as the first pair-part in an adjacency pair, the utterance type, a question, requires an answer in the next turn. Answering W's yes/no question, M confirms the answer she had suggested, with a *zero* utterance. This *zero*-utterance is followed by a micro pause. The pause probably indicates two different things. It indicates firstly that M has no intention to continue his talk, probably considering that the pause belongs to W, and secondly that W thinks that he is going to continue his talk because of his use of *zero*: by marking the utterance with *zero*, he gives no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded. Moreover, his use of the nominalizer *no* here, which seems likely to be unexpected, may have also motivated her to think that he is going to continue his talk since the nominalizer often occurs when the speaker intends to produce a new proposition next, treating the proposition contained in the nominalized structure as a ground or stage in a continuing account (see 4.2.2.4 for the nominalized structure). That is to say, the pause in line 5 indicates that his use of *zero* makes the flow of conversation problematic. We can then claim that M should have used *yo* instead of *zero* if he had no intention to



continue his turn after his answer in line 4. This is because *yo* indicates the speaker's intention that the figure emerging in the talk should be grounded and also directs an assumptive response typically by the addressee, thereby inviting W to produce a new proposition on the basis of M's answer to her previous question.

After the pause in line 5, M, having no response from W, emphasizes the proposition contained in his utterance in lines 2-4 with *hontoni* (Honestly):

6M: ho[n-toni ø.]  
honestly

6M: Honestly ø.

At this point, he uses *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded: he requires no response to it, probably because the utterance is just an extension.

Overlapping the end of M's utterance in line 6, W shows her understanding of M's answer with *fu::::n* (Ri::::ght), and says that the number of Lawsons in the town she lives in in Japan has been increasing recently:

6M: ho[n-toni ø.]  
honestly

7W: [fu::: ]:n. ko- chihoo ga ooi no- nanka saikin saikin  
right local S many Nom something recently recently

8W: dekihajimeta kedo ne:.  
started-to-be-built though ne

6M: Honestly ø.

7/8W: Ri::::ght. Many (Lawsons) are in local areas- er they have started being built (in my hometown) though ne:.

She produces the utterances in lines 7-8 probably because she feels it necessary to say something, having realized that M has no intention to develop his answer further. This claim may be supported by the indications of uncertainty in her utterances in line 7: a

self-editing marker in the form of a glottal-stop (indicated by a dash in the transcription) occurs twice after (*ko-* and *no-*) and she repeats *saikin* (recently) twice. That is to say, she does eventually treat M's utterance in lines 2-4 which was marked by *zero* as if it had been marked by *yo*.

\*\*\*\*\*

The above extract showed that M used *zero* at the point where *yo* would be more expectable, and furthermore that his failure to use *yo* disrupted the flow of the conversation and confused his interlocutor.

The next two extracts will illustrate further instances of his failure to use *yo*, and its disruptive influence on the conversation.

#### **6.2.2.1.7 Extract 7 - Failure to use *yo* (2)**

##### ***Synopsis: content***

This part of the exchange begins with W's explanation of her inaccurate comment on convenience stores in the preceding exchange: she says that she does not know about convenience stores since she does not go to them very often. M then says that he likes convenience stores very much, which invites her to say next that there are many people who often go to convenience stores.

##### ***Synopsis: NNS's particle use***

As in the previous exchange in 6.2.2.1.6, in this part of the exchange, M uses *zero* at a point where *yo* would be more expectable.

## Data

(From line 82 to line 85 in Appendix C)

1W: = u::n a soo ø. nanka anmari konbini iku hito janai  
Okay oh right something much convenience-store go person Cop-Neg

2W: kara ø.  
because

3M: ore: su- daisuki da ø konbini. =  
I like-very-much Cop convenience-store

4W: = nanka konbini (.) ni shocchuu iku hito i- kekkoo ooi jan ø?  
something convenience-store to often go person quite many Tag

(gloss)

1/2W: = O::kay. Right ø. Er because I don't go to convenience stores very often ø.

3M: I like them very much ø. =

4W: = Er some people often go to convenience stores, don't they ø?

## Analysis

In the talk leading up to this episode, M and W talk about convenience stores: she says that Seven-Elevens, one of the biggest convenience store chains in Japan, become smelly in winter because they sell *oden*, a Japanese dish containing all kinds of ingredients cooked in a special broth of soy sauce, sugar and sake. M then implies that what she has said is incorrect, saying that Lawson, another convenience store chain, also gets smelly in winter because of *oden*.

Having been corrected, in lines 1-2 W provides an explanation for her utterance, saying that she rarely uses convenience stores:

1W: = u::n. a soo ø. nanka anmari konbini iku hito janai  
okay oh so something much convenience-store go person Cop-Neg

2W: kara ø.  
because

1/2W: = O::kay. Right ø. Er because I don't go to convenience stores very often ø.

She marks the proposition that she rarely goes to convenience stores with *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded: she requires no particular response from M, intending the proposition to be no more than an explanation.

Having heard that W hardly uses convenience stores, M says that he is very fond of them:

3M: ore: su- daisuki                      da 0 konbini. =  
       I            like-very-much Cop    convenience-store  
 3M: I like them <sup>6</sup> very much 0. =

He appears to omit the object *konbini* (convenience stores) at first since it is obvious from the context. However, he then adds it to the proposition, making what he says more explicit. He marks his utterance with *zero*, which is to some degree unexpected. The unexpectedness here comes from the combination of the figure emerging in his talk and the function of *zero*. The proposition that M is very fond of convenience stores appears to jar with W's saying that she hardly goes to convenience stores. When a speaker says something which is conflict with the previous speaker's contribution we would expect him to invite continuation either by providing an explanation for his utterance or by asking for the addressee's response to what he has said. We can therefore argue that *yo* would be more expectable than *zero* here since *zero* does not have the force to develop the topic, whereas *yo* directs an assumptive response.

Having no particular instruction as to how M's utterance in line 3 should be responded to in the following turn, W says that there are many people who always go to convenience stores, and uses the tag-like expression *jan*:

---

<sup>6</sup> In the free translation, a pronominal anaphoric 'them' is used instead of the lexical noun 'convenience stores'. This is because the lexical noun is felt to be unmarked in Japanese and the pronoun unmarked in English.

4W: = *nanka*        *konbini* (.)        *ni shocchuu iku hito i- kekkoo ooi jan ø?*  
          something convenience-store to often    go person quite many Tag

4W: = Er some people often go to convenience stores, don't they ø?

The first word *nanka* transcribed as the filler (er) is equivalent to a pseudo-cleft such as 'what I want to say of convenience stores is...' and the micro pause after *konbini* (convenience stores) possibly indicates that W has difficulty in looking for a new proposition without M's instruction as to how his utterance in line 3 should be responded to. That is to say, the absence of *yo* disrupts the conversation.

#### 6.2.2.1.8 Extract 8 - Failure to use *yo* (3)

##### *Synopsis: content*

In this part of the exchange, M says that his commuting to his university is hard. W then says that she has a thirty-minute walk from her house to *Shiyya* station.

##### *Synopsis: NNS's particle use*

As in the previous two exchanges, in this part of the exchange, M uses *zero* at a point where *yo* would be more expectable.

##### *Data*

(From line 129 to line 139 in Appendix C)

1M: *ore jitensha* (0.5) *pakureraretara*,  
       I    bicycle            is-stolen-Conditional

2W: *un.*  
       uh-huh

3 (0.5)

4W: [paku]rerare[tara ø?]  
is-stolen-Conditional

5M: [( )] [un. ] eki [made, ]  
yes station to

6W: [huh huh]

7 (0.8)

8M: eki made nijuppu- niyu- nijuppun gurai,  
station to twenty-minutes around

9W: u:n.  
uh-huh

10M: aruki ø.  
walking

11W: shiia made sanjuppun na n da yo aruku to.  
Shiia to thirty-minutes Cop Nom Cop yo walk if

(gloss)

1M: If I have my bicycle stolen,

2W: Uh-huh.

3 (0.5)

4W: Stolen ø?

5M: Yes.

6W: (laughter)

7 (0.8)

8-10M: I had to walk for about twenty minutes to the station ø.

11W: It takes thirty minutes to Shiia yo - if I walk.

### ***Analysis***

In the preceding sequence, using the particle *yo*, W tries in vain to invite M to show his sympathy towards her effort commuting to her university in Japan.<sup>7</sup> Instead of showing sympathy, M says in lines 1-10 that he would have to walk for twenty minutes if he had his bicycle stolen:

1M: ore jitensha (0.5) pakureraretara,  
I bicycle is-stolen-Conditional

---

<sup>7</sup> This will be discussed in 6.2.2.2.6.

2W: un.  
uh-huh

3 (0.5)

4W: [paku]rerare[tara ø?]  
is-stolen-Conditional

5M: [( )] [un. ] eki [made, ]  
yes station to

6W: [huh huh]

7 (0.8)

8M: eki made nijuppu- ni ju- nijuppun gurai,  
station to twenty-minutes around

9W: u:n.  
uh-huh

10M: aruki ø.  
walking

1M: If I have my bicycle stolen,  
2W: Uh-huh.  
3: (0.5)  
4W: Stolen ø?  
5M: Yes.  
6W: (laughter)  
7 (0.8)  
8-10M: I had to walk for about twenty minutes to the station ø.

In line 1, he makes a mistake with the passive form of *pakuru* (to steal), saying *pakureraretara* rather than *pakuraretara*. Although W urges M to continue with *un* (Uh-huh), M does not produce a new proposition immediately: a 0.5 second pause occurs in line 3, after which W tells M indirectly that the verb form *pakureraretara* is incorrect by repeating M's mistake with rising intonation (line 4). It seems likely that she does this in order to tease him as he is very proud of his good command of the language. M, however, seems not to realise her intention: he just says 'Yes' overlapping the end of her tease and then continues his talk.

Again M's utterance in line 10 is not grammatically accurate: at the end of the utterance he uses the noun *aruki* (walk), to which the past tense of a copula *datta* (was)

should have been added. M marks the utterance with *zero*, which may also show his non-native ‘speaker-ness’: *yo*, directing the addressee’s assumptive response, would be more expectable than *zero* at this point. This is because, as W does with *yo* in the preceding sequence (which will be discussed in 6.2.2.2.6), M obviously intends to invite her sympathy for his situation. If he had used *yo* instead of *zero*, W might, for example, have commented on his experience. However, instead of commenting on M’s situation, in line 11 W again tells him how hard it was for her to commute to the university, saying that it takes thirty minutes on foot from her house to *Shiia*:

11W: shiia made sanjuppun        na n    da yo aruku to.  
      Shiia to    thirty-minutes Cop Nom Cop yo walk if

11W: It takes thirty minutes to Shiia yo - if I walk.

At this point, she uses *yo* again since she intends M to show his sympathy.

Even if M had used *yo* in line 10, W might have ignored its force and produced the same utterance since they are both boasting how hard commuting to their universities is. That is to say, whether M had used *yo* in line 10 or not might not have influenced the content of W’s next turn. However, she probably felt it awkward to keep inviting M to show sympathy, without knowing, since he had not used *yo*, that he also expects his boastful account to be responded to.

\*\*\*\*\*

The above three extracts showed M’s unexpected use of *zero* at points where *yo* would be more expectable. We can argue, from the above examination and the fact that he uses *yo* only once in the six-minute extract, that he is not very competent in the use of *yo* and *zero*. The examination also showed that his failure to use *yo* and his unexpected use of



*zero* disrupted the flow of the conversation since the absence of *yo* creates a contradiction between how the interlocutor would expect to respond to what is said and the instruction given by means of the particles (or lack of them).

Following this examination of M's uses of *ne* and *yo*, we will next move to the examination of his use of *yone*. Although M does not use *yone*, in the data analysed in this research he uses *yona*, a variant of *ne*, once. There is also one case in which he uses *zero* at the point where *yone* would be more expectable. We will examine these cases in the following sub-sections.

#### **6.2.2.1.9 Extract 9 - Expectable use of *yone***

##### ***Synopsis: content***

In this part of the exchange, M and W talk about whether the old *natto* on the table in his room should be thrown out.

##### ***Synopsis: NNS's particle use***

In this part of the exchange, M uses *yona* in an expectable way.

##### ***Data***

(From line 1 to line 12 in Appendix C)

1M: *natto wa* (.) *hontoni*, (.)  
     *nattoo Top*       *really*

2W: *tabenai yo*..  
     *don't-eat yo*

3M: *suteyoo*           *ka* ∅.  
     *dump-Volitional Q*

4W: *huh huh huh* (.) *u- doozo sute* ∅.  
                         *please dump-Request*

5M: dakara mottainai jan ø.  
as-I-said-before wasteful Tag

6 (3.0)

7W: ja tabereba ii jan ø. [( )]  
if-so eat-Conditional good Tag

8M: [na- nanka] (.) nanka bimyooni,  
something something subtly

9W: zettai tabenai yo. datte mecha hen na nioi shiteru mon ø. =  
definitely don't-eat yo because very strange Cop smell come-out because

10M: = huh huh huh huh huh huh soo da yo[:na::.. huh (.) huh ]  
so Cop yo na

11W: [huh huh huh huh huh] huh

12W: okashii mon ø kono nioi ga:. =  
strange because this smell S

(gloss)

1M: This natto really, (.)  
2W: I won't eat it yo:.  
3M: Shall we throw it away ø?  
4W: (laughter) (.) Go on throw it away ø.  
5M: As I said before dumping the natto is wasteful, isn't it ø?  
6 (3.0)  
7W: If you say so, you eat it ø.  
8M: Er (.) er a little bit,  
9W: I won't definitely eat it yo. Because it stinks ø. =  
10M: = (laughter) That's right yo:na::.. (laughter)  
11/12W: (laughter) Because this smells odd ø. =

## Analysis

In line 1, M starts talking about the *natto* on the table in the room where the talk-in-interaction is taking place, saying 'This *natto* really'. This is followed by a short pause:

1M: natto wa (.) hontoni, (.)  
nattoo Top really

1M: This natto really, (.)

This pause probably indicates his need for processing time as he searches for an

appropriate comment. That is to say, the pause should be attributed to M rather than W.

However, W does not wait for him to produce a comment: interrupting M's utterance, W says that she won't eat the *natto*:

2W: tabenai yo:.<sup>8</sup>  
don't-eat yo

2W: I won't eat it yo:.

M then suggests to W that they should get rid of it:

3M: suteyoo ka ø.  
dump-Volitional Q

3M: Shall we throw it away ø?

He marks the suggestion with *zero* since, as the first pair-part in an adjacency pair, a suggestion directs either an acceptance or a refusal in the next turn.

Following M's suggestion, W laughs and agrees that it should be thrown away:

4W: huh huh huh (.) u- doozo sutete ø.  
please dump-Request

4W: (laughter) (.) Go on throw it away ø.

Her laughter here indicates that M's response in line 3 is unexpected: she probably had not thought that he would accept her opinion so unquestioningly. She marks her acceptance with *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded: she requires no particular response to her acceptance from M, intending her response to be treated as no more than her acceptance.

Having had W's acceptance, M however does not take the action they had agreed. Instead, he insists that throwing the *natto* away is wasteful:

---

<sup>8</sup> W's use of *yo* here and M's response will be examined in 6.2.2.2.5.

5M: dakara mottainai jan ø.  
as-I-said-before wasteful Tag

5M: As I said before dumping the *natto* is wasteful, isn't it ø?

After his suggestion to throw the *natto* away in line 3, W probably does not expect such an objection now. M's use of *dakara* (As-I-said-before) is also likely to be unpredicted by W since M has not said that the *natto* should not be dumped in the earlier exchange: he uses *dakara* inappropriately, perhaps thinking that *dakara* has the force of 'but' derived from the default meaning 'therefore'. He marks the utterance with *zero* because he adds the tag-like expression *jan* to the end of the utterance. This utterance is followed by a three second pause:

6: (3.0)

This pause may support the above argument: W is not able to respond to what M has said in line 5 immediately because she did not expect it.

After this pause, W tells M to eat the *natto*:

7W: ja tabereba ii jan ø. [( )]  
if-so eat-Conditional good Tag

7W: If you say so, you eat it ø.

At this point, she uses *zero* because she adds the tag-like expression *jan* to the end of her the utterance. She then says something which the analyst has not been able to recover.

Overlapping this, M starts mentioning something about the *natto*, saying 'Er (.) er a little bit,':

8M: [na- nanka] (.) nanka bimyooni,  
something something subtly

8M: Er (.) er a little bit,

Interrupting his utterance, W says that she will never eat the *natto*. At this point, she uses

*yo*, intending the figure emerging in the talk to be grounded and also directing an assumptive response. She produces the assumptive response herself, saying that it smells very bad:

9W: zettai tabenai yo. datte mecha hen na nioi shiteru mon ø. =  
definitely don't-eat yo because very strange Cop smell come-out because

9W: I won't definitely eat it yo. Because it stinks ø.

The first word in the assumptive response '*datte*' can be considered as her orientation to the force of *yo* in her own utterance. She marks her assumptive response with *zero*. She uses *zero* here probably because she thinks that the force of her suggestion in line 7 still remains in effect.

The proposition contained in W's utterance in line 9 brings about M's laughter. After his laughter, he then shows his agreement to the proposition contained in her utterances in line 9:

10M: = huh huh huh huh huh huh soo da **yo**[:**na**::. huh (.) huh]  
so Cop yo na

10M: (laughter) That's right **yo:na**::. (laughter)

At this point, he uses *yona*. *Na* is a variant of *ne*, and typically a male register. *Soo da yone* (It is so *yone*) is now an idiomatic item, and it seems that *yo* in *yone* has only very weak sequential force: it is often used even when the speaker does not think that the topic is worth continuing but intends to represent himself being actively involved in the talk and willing to give the turn back to the interlocutor (see p.58). *Soo da yona* (It is so *yona*) is also used for the same purpose.

M and W both laugh following M's *yona*-utterance, W's laughter overlapping *na* in the *yona* utterance. After her laughter, she just repeats the proposition contained in her

utterance in line 9 that the *natto* smells strange:

10M: = huh huh huh huh huh huh soo da **yo[:na::** huh (.) huh]  
so Cop yo na

11W: [huh huh huh huh huh] huh

12W: okashii mon ø kono nioi ga:. =  
strange because this smell S

10M: (laughter) That's right **yo:na::** (laughter)

11/12W: (laughter) Because this smells odd ø.

At this point, she uses *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded: it seems that the topic is exhausted.

\*\*\*\*\*

The extract analysed above showed his use of *yona*, a variant of *ne*. His use of it was expectable: although he was not interested in the topic, he represented himself as actively involved in the exchange. As we pointed out, however, *soo da yo ne/na* (It is so *yo ne/na*) is now an idiomatic expression, not fully comparable to attaching *yone/yona* to the proposition the speaker creates by himself in an expectable way.

The following extract will illustrate a case where M uses *zero* at a point where *yone* would be more expectable.

#### 6.2.2.1.10 Extract 10 - Failure to use *yone*

##### *Synopsis: content*

In this part of the exchange, which overlaps the end of Extract 3, M says that although there are Lawsons and Seven-Elevens near his apartment, the former are

friendlier than the latter.

### ***Synopsis: NNS's particle use***

In this part of the exchange, M uses *zero* at the point where *yone* would be more expectable.

### ***Data***

(From line 72 to line 79 in Appendix C)

1M: = de (2.8) rooson chikai kara,  
and Lawson near because

2W: un.  
uh-huh

3M: de sebunirebun mo chikai no ne. =  
and Seven-Eleven also near Nom ne

4W: = u[n.]  
uh-huh

5M: [de]mo (.) rooson no hoo ga nanka koo::, =  
but Lawson LK side S something er

6W: = u::n. a demo wakarū ka[mo ø.]  
yes but know may

7M: [a ]tataakai ø. =  
warm

8W: = nanka sa: sebunirebun tte oden no nioi ga kusakunai ø?  
Something IP Seven-Eleven Top oden LK smell S don't-stink

(gloss)

1M: = and (2.8) because a Lawson is near (my house),

2W: Uh-huh.

3M: and a Seven-Eleven is also near no ne. =

4W: = Uh-huh.

5M: But (.) the Lawson is more er, =

6W: = Right:t. But I probably know what you mean ø.

7M: friendly ø. =

8W: = Don't Seven-Elevens's *oden* stink ø? =

## *Analysis*

In the preceding sequence, M says that he became hungry around at ten o'clock after coming back from a college sports club and then finishing his homework. In lines 1-3, M then says 'Because Lawson is near (my house) and Seven-Eleven is also nearby'. This utterance is completed by the combination of the nominalizer *no* and the particle *ne*, indicating that he is going to produce a new proposition next on the basis of the proposition marked by the combination:

1M: = de (2.8) rooson chikai kara,  
and Lawson near because  
2W: un.  
uh-huh  
3M: de sebunirebun mo chikai no ne. =  
and Seven-Eleven also near Nom ne  
1M: = and (2.8) because Lawson is near (my house),  
2W: Uh-huh.  
3M: and Seven-Eleven is also near no ne. =

M's utterance is followed by W's expectable *aizuchi*, which urges him to continue his talk:

4W: = u[n.]  
uh-huh  
4W: = Uh-huh.

Overlapping the end of W's *aizuchi*, M continues his talk, saying 'But (.) the Lawson is more er::,':

5M: [de]mo (.) rooson no hoo ga nanka koo::, =  
but Lawson LK side S something er  
5M: But (.) the Lawson is more er::, =

Interrupting M's utterance, W shows her understanding with *u::n* (Righ::t) and says that





utterance in line 7 and would show M's expectation that W will accept that the topic is worthy of being developed, thereby enabling the conversation to proceed in some as yet to be determined way.

Having had no particular instruction as to how M's utterance in lines 5-7 should be responded to next, W produces a proposition which has no direct relation to the proposition contained in M's utterance: she says that Seven-Elevens become smelly because of *oden*, a kind of Japanese dish.

8W: = *nanka*        *sa:* *sebunirebun*    *tte* *oden no nioi*    *ga* *kusakunai*  $\emptyset$ ?  
       Something IP    Seven-Eleven Top    oden LK smell S    don't-stink

8W: = Ere don't Seven-Eleven's *oden* stink  $\emptyset$ ? =

The words *nanka sa:* (translated as 'Er:') at the beginning indicate the processing time W requires to produce a new proposition; if she had been instructed as to how M's utterance in lines 5-7 should be responded to next, these words might not have occurred since she would have been given an indication of the kind of (restricted) response expected.

\*\*\*\*\*

The two extracts analysed above showed one case in which M used the idiomatic expression *soo da yona* (It is so *yona*) expectably and one case in which he used *zero* at the point in which *yone* would have been more expectable.

Having already shown that M uses *ne* more capably than *yo*, what can we say about his use of *yone*? The fact that there were no cases where he attached *yone* to his original proposition in the six-minute talk data does not of itself indicate that he is not capable of the use of *yone*. In fact W did not use *yone* either during these six minutes, which may suggest that the talk type of the data analysed in this chapter does not require

*yone* to occur as often as *yo* and *ne*. Moreover, the one instance where M's use of *yone* would have been appropriate depended on his ability to recognize the nature of a preceding contribution by W, so that this *yone*-slot was to a degree untypical.

So far we have examined cases in which M uses *zero* at the point where a particular particle would be more expectable. The following extract shows a case in which M uses *zero* at a point where any one of *ne*, *yo* or *yone* would be expectable.

#### **6.2.2.1.11 Extract 11 - Failure to use *ne*, *yo* or *yone***

##### ***Synopsis: content***

In the preceding sequence, M says that the bus service in the city in which he lived was very poor. In this part of the exchange, W then asks him if the train service was also poor. M replies that the train service is not poor and adds that an underground service is also available. Having received M's answer, W starts talking about what one of her friends told her, that students in rural areas prefer renting a room in town to spending an hour commuting when the train service is poor. M then says that the train and the underground are different.

##### ***Synopsis: NNS's particle use***

In this part of the exchange, M uses *zero* at the point where any one of *ne*, *yo* or *yone* would be more expectable.

## *Data*

(From line 153 to line 183 in Appendix C)

- 1W: [e den]sha mo hyottoshite ichijikan  
er train also possibly one-hour
- 2W: ni nihon toka ø?  
at two-train and-so-on
- 3M: uuu:n. =  
no
- 4W: = soko[ma ]de wa nai ø? =  
to-that-extent Top Neg
- 5M: [so-]
- 6M: = chikatetsu, =  
underground
- 7W: = a hattatsushiteiru n da ø.  
is-developed Nom Cop
- 8M: so chika- tu:- chikatetsu wa chanto hashitten kedo, =  
so underground Top properly run although
- 9W: = soo ka soo ka ø. =  
so Q so Q
- 10M: = un demo, (sniffing) =  
yes but
- 11W: = nanka yamagata no tomodachi ga ne::,  
something Yamagata LK friend S ne
- 12M: u[n.]  
uh-huh
- 13W: [na]nka tookyoo no ko tte: (.) gakkoo ni: ichijikan toka  
something Tokyo LK students Top school for one-hour and-so-on
- 14W: kake temo kayoo no ne:.  
spend even commute Nom ne
- 15M: un. =  
uh-huh
- 16W: = demo chihoo no ko tte sore ga nai n da tte::, =  
but local LK student Top that S Neg Nom Cop QT
- 17M: = un nai nai ø.  
yes Neg Neg
- 18W: ichijikan kakeru gurai nara geshukusuru n da tte::, =  
one-hour spend about if live-alone Nom Cop QT
- 19M: = un.  
uh-huh

20 (.)

21W: de nande tte kiitara ne: densha wa ichijikan ni ippon toka  
and why QT when-asked ne train Top one-hour at one-train and-so-on

22W: shikanai kara ne::,  
only because ne

23M: un.  
uh-huh

24W: sono ippon o tobashitara taihen na koto ni naru  
that one-train O miss-Conditional terrible Cop matter to become

25W: kara [tte,]  
because QT

26M: [un. ] sorya-  
yes

27M: soryaa (.) densha no koto da ø.  
that-Top train LK matter Cop

28W: u:[:n.]  
yes

29M: [chi]katetsu to mata chotto chigau n da ø.  
Underground from also little different Nom Cop

30W: soo ka: ø.  
so Q

(gloss)

1/2W: Are there only two trains each hour or anything or that sort of thing ø?

3M: No. =

4W: = Not that bad ø? =

6M: = Underground, =

7W: = Oh so it's developed ø.

8M: Although the underground runs properly, =

9W: = Okay okay ø. =

10M: = yeah but, (sniffing) =

11W: = Er one of my friends who is from Yamagata ne::,

12M: Uh-huh.

13/14W: er students in Tokyo usually spend one hour on going to university no ne::.

15M: Uh-huh. =

16W: = but she said that students in local areas do not and, =

17M: = Yeah, they don't

18W: she also said that students in local areas choose to rent a room rather than spending one hour on commuting, =

19M: = Uh-huh.

20 (.)

21/22W: and I asked her why ne: she said that there is only one train in an hour ne::: (in local areas),

23M: Uh-huh.

24/25W: if you miss that train you will be in trouble and,

26/27M: Yeah. That's about railway ø.

28W: Righ::t.

29M: Trains are a bit different from undergrounds ø.

30W: Ri:ght ø.

### *Analysis*

M has just said that he would have to walk back home from the university if he had had his bicycle stolen since the bus service is very poor. Overlapping the end of his utterance, W asks him if the train service in the city is similar to the bus service:

1W: [e den]sha mo hyottoshite ichijikan  
er train also possibly one-hour

2W: ni nihon toka ø?  
at two-train and-so-on

1/2W: Are there only two trains each hour or that sort of thing ø?

She marks the question with *zero* since the utterance type, a question, requires a matching second pair-part in the form of an answer.

M gives her a negative answer with *uuu:n* (no):

3M: uuu:n. =  
no

3M: No. =

Having received this negative answer, W might have thought that the public transport in the city may be better than she imagines: in a latched utterance, she asks him if the public transportation is poor:

4W: = soko[ma ]de wa nai ø?. =  
to-that-extent Top Neg

4W: = Not that bad ø? =

She again marks the question with *zero* since the utterance type, a question, requires a matching second pair-part in the form of an answer.

Having been asked the question, M starts his response by mentioning the

underground service in the city:

5M: [so-]

6M: = chikatetsu, =  
underground

5/6M: = Underground, =

In her interruption, W shows her surprise at hearing that there is underground service in the city, saying that the city is developed:

7W: = a hattatsushiteiru n da ø.  
is-developed Nom Cop

7W: = Oh so it's developed ø.

She marks the question with *zero* since she intends the utterance to be just an exclamation to show her surprise: it is obvious that M is going to produce a new proposition.

M then restarts his talk, beginning “Although the underground runs properly” (line 8), which is interrupted by W who shows her understanding of it with *soo ka soo ka* (Okay okay) in line 9:

8M: so chika- tu:- chikatetsu wa chanto hashitten kedo, =  
so underground Top properly run although

9W: = soo ka soo ka ø. =  
so Q so Q

8M: Although the underground runs properly, =

9W: = Okay okay ø. =

W's understanding is followed by M's *un demo* (yeah but):

10M: = un demo, (sniffing) =  
yes but

10M: = yeah but, (sniffing) =

Not letting M continue, W starts telling him the story she had heard from her friend; she

says that her friend from Yamagata prefecture, a rural area, told her that while university students in Tokyo spend an hour commuting, students in Yamagata do not (lines 11-16):

11W: = nanka yamagata no tomodachi ga ne::,  
something Yamagata LK friend S ne

12M: u[n.]  
uh-huh

13W: [na]nka tookyoo no ko tte: (.) gakkoo ni: ichijikan toka  
something Tokyo LK students Top school for one-hour and-so-on

14W: kake temo kayoo no ne:.  
spend even commute Nom ne

15M: un. =  
uh-huh

16W: = demo chihoo no ko tte sore ga nai n da tte::, =  
but local LK student Top that S Neg Nom Cop QT

11W: = Er one of my friends who is from Yamagata ne::,

12M: Uh-huh.

13/14W: er students in Tokyo usually spend one hour on going to university no ne::

15M: Uh-huh. =

16W: = but she said that students in local areas do not and, =

At this point, M agrees with W's friend's opinion that students in local areas do not spend a lot of time commuting:

17M: = un nai nai ø.  
yes Neg Neg

17M: = Yeah, they don't ø.

At this point, he uses *zero* since he obviously presumes that W is going to continue the story.

W then restarts her talk, saying that her friend also told her that students in local areas choose to rent a room near the university rather than spending an hour commuting since missing trains in local areas may be a big problem if there is only one train every hour:



18W: ichijikan kakeru gurai nara geshukusuru n da tte::, =  
 one-hour spend about if live-alone Nom Cop QT

19M: = un.  
 uh-huh

20 (.)

21W: de nande tte kiitara ne: densha wa ichijikan ni ippon toka  
 and why QT when-asked ne train Top one-hour at one-train and-so-on

22W: shikanai kara ne::,  
 only because ne

23M: un.  
 uh-huh

24W: sono ippon o tobashitara taihen na koto ni naru  
 that one-train O miss-Conditional terrible Cop matter to become

25W: kara [tte,]  
 because QT

18W: she also said that students in local areas choose to rent a room rather than spending one hour on commuting, =

19M: = Uh-huh.

20 (.)

21/22W: and I asked her why ne: she said that there is only one train in an hour ne:: (in local areas),

23M: Uh-huh.

24/25W: if you miss that train you will be in trouble and,

Having been told the story W heard from her friend, M fails to show his understanding of it and thereby maintain his rapport with W. Instead, he implies that what she has just said is irrelevant in the context of the conversation where he was talking about the underground service, saying that what she has mentioned in lines 21-25 is about the railway:

26M: [un. ] sorya-  
 yes

27M: soryaa (.) densha no koto da 0.  
 that-Top train LK matter Cop

26/27M: Yeah. That's about railway 0.

At this point, he uses *zero*. His use of *zero* here sounds very blunt since it indicates that he requires no particular response to his dismissal of a contribution she has made over

several turns. Instead of *zero*, either *ne*, *yo* or *yone* would be more expectable here. He could have used *ne* to suggest that he wanted her acceptance of his comment as a ground. Or he could have used *yo*, intending his disapproval to be grounded and directing an assumptive response. Or, he could also have used *yone*, directing her acceptance that his disapproval is worthy of being developed further. Thus, by marking his disapproval with either *ne*, *yo* or *yone*, he could have given her the chance to respond in one of a range of different ways.

W accepts the bluntly expressed opinion that the story she heard from her friend is not relevant half-heartedly with *u::n* (righ::t):

28W: u:[:n.]  
yes

28W: Righ::t.

Overlapping the end of this acceptance, M makes his implication in lines 26-27 explicit, saying that the railway service is slightly different from the underground service:

29M: [chi]katetsu to mata chotto chigau n da ø.  
Underground from also little different Nom Cop

30W: soo ka: ø.  
so Q

29M: Trains are a bit different from undergrounds ø.

30W: Ri:ght ø.

\*\*\*\*\*

The above extract showed a case where M uses *zero* at a point where *ne*, *yo* or *yone* would be more expectable. As with the examination of earlier extracts, this analysis also indicates that M's unexpected use of *zero*, i.e. his omission of an expectable particle, disrupts the flow of conversation, making the exchange sound awkward in places where

instructions as to how the utterance should be responded to are required.

The extracts examined so far in this chapter show how the NNS, M, uses the particles *ne*, *yo* and *yone* and *zero* in both expectable and unexpected ways. The following eight extracts will show how M responds to utterances in which the particles occur. To begin with, we will examine how M responds to utterances in which *ne* occurs, and then investigate how he responds to utterances in which *yo* occurs. As mentioned earlier, *yone* does not occur in W's utterances.

### **6.2.2.2 Responses to particles**

#### **6.2.2.2.1 Extract 12 - Expectable responses to utterance-final *ne***

##### ***Synopsis: content***

In this part of the exchange, M talks about the place where his apartment in Japan was located.

##### ***Synopsis: NNS's particle use***

In this part of the exchange, M responds expectably to W's utterances in which utterance-final *ne* occur.

##### ***Data***

(From line 109 to line 118 in Appendix C)

1M: ore (.) ano oka no ue ni sundeita kara,  
I er hill LK top at lived because

2W: u[n. ]  
uh-huh

3M: [do-] dokka e iku nimo,  
somewhere to go in-order-to

4W: un.  
uh-huh

5M: ikoo nimo (.) ano:: (0.8) ko- o- oka orinakyaikenai no ø.  
go-Volitional in-order-to er hill need-to-go-down Nom

6M: oriru no wa sore wa sorede ii n dakedo kaettekuru toki  
go-down Nom Top that Top by-itself good Nom but return when

7M: taihen [( )]  
hard-work

8W: [taihe]n da **ne**.  
hard-work Cop ne

9M: **un**.  
yes

10 (2.0)

(gloss)

1M: Because I lived on the top of a hill,  
2W: Uh-huh.  
3M: going anywhere,  
4W: Uh-huh.  
5-7M: going anywhere (.) er:: (0.8) I have to go down the hill ø. To go down is not a problem,  
but to return is a hard-work ( )  
8W: It's a hard-work **ne**.  
9M: **Yes**.  
10 (2.0)

## *Analysis*

In lines 1-7, M says that because he lived on the top of a hill in Japan, going down was not a problem but coming back was hard-work (*taihen*):

1M: ore (.) ano oka no ue ni sundeita kara,  
I er hill LK top at lived because  
2W: u[n. ]  
uh-huh  
3M: [do-] dokka e iku nimo,  
somewhere to go in-order-to

4W: un.  
uh-huh

5M: ikoo nimo (.) ano:: (0.8) ko- o- oka orinakyaikenai no ø..  
go-Volitional in-order-to er hill need-to-go-down Nom

6M: oriru no wa sore wa sore de ii n dakedo kaettekuru toki  
go-down Nom Top that Top that with good Nom but return when

7M: taihen [( )]  
hard-work

1M: Because I lived on the top of a hill,

2W: Uh-huh.

3M: going anywhere,

4W: Uh-huh.

5-7M: going anywhere (.) er:: (0.8) I have to go down the hill ø. To go down is not a problem,  
but to return is a hard-work ( )

Having heard about the location of M's apartment in Japan in lines 1-7, overlapping the end of M's utterance, W shows her agreement that coming back is a problem when you live at the top of a hill by repeating the adjective *taihen* (hard-work) in M's utterance in line 7:

8W: [taihe]n da ne.  
hard-work Cop ne

8W: It's a hard-work ne.

At this point, she uses *ne*, proposing that the figure emerging in the talk should be treated as a ground for the next proposition without further ado and also obtaining M's acceptance: as discussed before, it is conventional for the speaker to mark his agreement with the addressee's opinion with *ne*, thereby intensifying his rapport with her.

Reacting to the force of utterance-final *ne* in W's utterance, he expectably shows his acceptance with *un* (Yes):

9M: un.  
yes

9M: Yes.

The topic seems exhausted at this point. A two-second pause occurs:

10 (2.0)

In his following turn, M then says that a bicycle is not convenient if you live at the top of a hill.

\*\*\*\*\*

The above extract showed M's ability to produce an expected response to an utterance in which utterance-final *ne* occurs. The following extract will show his ability to produce expectable responses to utterances in which utterance-internal *ne* and *ne* attached to a nominalized structure occur.

#### **6.2.2.2.2 Extract 13 - Expectable responses to utterance-internal *ne* and *ne* attached to a nominalized structure**

##### ***Synopsis: content***

In this part of the exchange, which partly overlaps Extract 11, W explains what one of her friends told her about the different attitudes of students in rural areas and in big cities to commuting.

##### ***Synopsis: NNS's response to particle use***

In this part of the exchange, M responds expectably to W's utterances in which utterance-internal *ne* and *ne* attached to a nominalized structure occur.

## Data

(From line 163 to line 177 in Appendix C)

1W: = nanka yamagata no tomodachi ga **ne::**,  
something Yamagata LK friend S ne

2M: **u[n.]**  
uh-huh

3W: [na]nka tookyoo no ko tte: (.) gakkoo ni: ichijikan toka  
something Tokyo LK students Top school for one-hour and-so-on

4W: kake temo kayoo **no ne::**.  
spend even commute Nom ne

5M: **un.** =  
uh-huh

6W: = demo chihoo no ko tte sore ga nai n da tte::, =  
but local LK student Top that S Neg Nom Cop QT

7M: = un nai nai ø.  
yes Neg Neg

8W: ichijikan kakeru gurai nara geshukusuru n da tte::, =  
one-hour spend about if live-alone Nom Cop QT

9M: = un.  
uh-huh

10 (.)

11W: de nande tte kiitara **ne:** densha wa ichijikan ni ippon toka  
and why QT when-asked ne train Top one-hour at one-train and-so-on

12W: shikanai kara **ne::**,  
only because ne

13M: **un.**  
uh-huh

14W: sono ippon o tobashitara taihen na koto ni naru  
that one-train O miss-Conditional terrible Cop matter to become

15W: kara [tte,]  
because QT

(gloss)

1W: = Er one of my friends who is from Yamagata **ne::**,

2M: **Uh-huh.**

3/4W: er students in Tokyo usually spend one hour on going to university **no ne::**.

5M: **Uh-huh.** =

6W: = but she said that students in local areas do not and, =

7M: = Yeah, they don't ø.

8W: she also said that students in local areas choose to rent a room rather than spending an hour commuting, =

9M: = Uh-huh.

10           (.)  
 11/12W: and I asked her why *ne*: she said that there is only one train an hour *ne::* (in local areas),  
 13M:       **Uh-huh.**  
 14/15W: if you miss that train, you will be in trouble and,

## *Analysis*

As seen in the above extract, in this part of the exchange, W explains that one of her friends told her that students in rural areas prefer renting rooms to spending an hour commuting since the train service is very poor.

W's utterances in lines 1-4 contain two uses of *ne*, and M reacts to the force of each expectably:

1W: = *nanka*        *yamagata no tomodachi ga ne::*,  
          something Yamagata LK friend        S    *ne*  
 2M: **u[n.]**  
       uh-huh  
 3W: [*na*]*nka*        *tookyoo no ko*            *tte: (.) gakkou ni: ichijikan toka*  
          something Tokyo        LK students Top            school for one-hour and-so-on  
 4W: *kake temo kayoo no ne:.*  
       spend even commute Nom *ne*  
 5M: **un.** =  
       uh-huh  
 1W:        = Er one of my friends who is from Yamagata *ne::*,  
 2M:        **Uh-huh.**  
 3/4W:      er students in Tokyo usually spend one hour on going to university *no ne:*.  
 5M:        **Uh-huh.** =

Firstly, she uses utterance-internal *ne* in line 1. This is because she proposes that the information units (i.e. 'a friend from Yamagata prefecture' + the subject marker *ga*) marked with *ne* should be treated as a topic for the comment that is to come. In the following turn (line 2), M responds to the force of *ne*, showing his understanding of her intention with *aizuchi*, signalled by *un* (Uh-huh). Secondly, she attaches *ne* to the nominalized structure in line 4, intending to direct the addressee's acceptance as a ground



for the next proposition in the sequence, that a friend from Yamagata prefecture told her that university students in Tokyo spend an hour commuting. In the following turn (line 5), M again responds to the force of *ne* with *un* (Uh-huh), thus showing his understanding of it.

In lines 11 and 12, W again uses utterance-internal *ne*:

11W: de nande tte kiitara    **ne**: densha wa ichijikan ni ippon    toka  
and why    QT    when-asked ne    train    Top one-hour    at one-train and-so-on

12W: shikanai kara    **ne**::,  
only    because ne

13M: **un**.  
uh-huh

14W: sono ippon    o tobashitara    taihen na koto ni naru  
that one-train O miss-Conditional terrible Cop matter to become

15W: kara    [tte,]  
because    QT

11/12W: and I asked her why **ne**: she said that there is only one train an hour **ne**:: (in local areas),

13M:    **Uh-huh**.

14/15W: if you miss that train, you will be in trouble and,

Although M responds to the second use of *ne* with *un* (Uh-huh) in line 13, there is no evidence in the recording that he responds to the first use of *ne* in line 11, although he may have responded to it non-verbally. However, as already mentioned before (p.126), the acceptance seeking force of utterance-internal *ne* is probably rather weak in comparison with that of utterance-final *ne* because the former just requires the addressee's *aizuchi*. Having considered this, it would not be surprising if utterance-internal *ne* is not responded to on occasion, especially when the information unit marked with *ne* is rather short, as here.

\*\*\*\*\*

The above extract (Extract 13) showed M's expectable responses to utterance-internal *ne* and also to *ne* attached to a nominalized structure. Having considered that he also showed an expectable response to utterance-final *ne* in Extract 12, the evidence so far suggests that he is capable of responding to *ne*. The two following extracts will, however, illustrate responses to utterance-internal *ne* and utterance-final *ne*, which might possibly be considered unexpected.

#### 6.2.2.2.3 Extract 14 - Failure to respond to utterance-internal *ne*

##### *Synopsis: content*

In this part of the exchange, which overlaps the end of Extract 6, W talks about the locations of convenience stores in her town.

##### *Synopsis: NNS's response*

In this exchange, M may have failed to respond in an expectable manner to utterance-internal *ne* in W's utterance.

##### *Data*

(From line 26 to line 36 in Appendix C)

- 1W: [fu:: ]:n. ko- chihoo ga ooi no- nanka saikin saikin  
right local S many Nom something recently recently
- 2W: dekihajimeta kedo ne:.  
started-to-build though ne
- 3M: nani ga ø?  
what S

4W: rooson ø.  
Lawson

5 (1.5)

6W: eki mae ni niken aru ø. dakedo,  
station front at two-shops exist but

7M: un.  
uh-huh

8W: sore made wa famirima no hoo ga ookatta kara **ne**.  
then until Top Family-Mart LK side S were-many because ne

9 (.)

10W: famirima sangen to (.) de sebunirebun ga ( ) ni  
Family-Mart three-shops and and Seven-Eleven S at

11W: ikken atte:: (1.5) de:: rooson ga [( )] ni niken atte::,  
one-shop exist-and and Lawson S at two-shops exist-and

(gloss)

1/2W: Ri:::ght. Many are in local areas- er they have started being built (in my hometown) though ne:.

3M: What have started being built ø?

4W: Lawsons ø.

5 (1.5)

6W: There are two in front of the train station ø. But,

7M: Uh-huh.

8W: because we had more Family-Marts (than Lawsons) until then **ne**.

9 (.)

10/11W: Three Family-Marts (.) and one Seven-Eleven at ( ) (1.5) and two Lawsons at ( ),

## Analysis

M having said in the preceding sequence that there are many Lawsons in the city in which he lived, W shows her understanding, by saying ‘Ri:::ght. Many are in local areas’, and then adds that the number of Lawsons in the town she lives in Japan has been increasing:

1W: [fu:: ]:n. ko- chihoo ga ooi no- nanka saikin saikin  
right local S many Nom something recently recently

2W: dekihajimeta kedo ne:.  
started-to-build and ne

1/2W: Ri:::ght. Many (Lawsons) are in local areas- er they have started being built (in my hometown) though ne:.

In line 1, two self-editing glottal-stops (*ko-* and *no-*), *nanka* (something) and the repeated

word *saikin* (recently) indicate W's search for a new proposition. She also omits the subject, i.e. Lawson, probably because she has no time to formulate the utterance properly or because she thinks that the topic is clear from the preceding sequence of utterances.

At this point, she uses utterance-internal *ne*, which is used when the speaker proposes that the information unit(s) should be treated as a ground by the addressee for one or more upcoming lexical units, and also directs the addressee's acceptance, typically expressed by means of *aizuchi*. In this case, it appears that W has not yet decided what she is going to say next and has started talking for the sake of maintaining the conversation.

The omission of the subject in W's utterance in lines 1-2 seems to confuse M, and he asks her for clarification:

3M: nani ga ø?  
what S

3M: What have they started to build ø?

He marks the question with *zero* since the utterance type, a question, requires a matching second pair-part in the form of an answer.

Answering M's question, W makes the subject explicit saying 'Lawsons':

4W: rooson ø.  
Lawson

4W: Lawsons ø.

At this point, she uses *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded. This is because she intends it to be no more than a clarification.

The subject of W's utterance in lines 1-2 having been clarified, M's response to what she said is presumably expected next. However, he does not provide this response: W's utterance in line 4 is followed by a 1.5 second pause:

This pause impels W to say something in order to maintain the conversation: she says that although there are two Lawsons in front of the train station in her town, formerly the number of Family-Marts was greater than the number of Lawsons:

6W: eki        mae    ni niken        aru ø. dakedo,  
station front at two-shops exist but

7M: un.  
uh-huh

8W: sore made wa famirima    no hoo ga ookatta    kara    **ne**,  
then until Top Family-Mart LK side S were-many because ne

6W: There are two in front of the train station ø. But,

7M: Uh-huh.

8W: because we had more Family-Marts (than Lawsons) until then **ne**,

At this point, she again uses utterance-internal *ne*, which signals her intention that the information units marked with *ne* should be treated as a ground for what is to be said next, and thus directs his acceptance.

Yet his acceptance does not appear in the transcription: indeed, a micro pause occurs:

This pause suggests that M fails to show his acceptance and also that W expects his verbal acknowledgement here. Remember that we argued above that it would not be surprising if utterance-internal *ne* is not responded to with the addressee's acceptance on occasion because it only requires *aizuchi*. However, when the information units marked with *ne* is relatively long, the addressee's verbal acceptance is more likely to be required so as to support the development of the speaker's talk. Therefore, W might have felt uneasy with M's failure to show his acceptance in line 9.

After the pause, W continues her talk, talking about the locations of convenience stores in her town:

10W: famirima sangen to (.) de sebunirebun ga ( ) ni  
 Family-Mart three-shops and and Seven-Eleven S at  
 11W: ikken atte:: (1.5) de:: rooson ga [( )] ni niken atte::,  
 one-shop exist-and and Lawson S at two-shops exist-and  
 10/11W: Three Family-Marts (.) and one Seven-Eleven at ( ) (1.5) and two Lawsons at ( ),

#### 6.2.2.2.4 Extract 15 - Failure to respond to utterance-final *ne*

##### *Synopsis: content*

This part of the exchange begins with M's utterance that Lawsons saved him. This utterance then prompts W to ask him if it was his life that Lawsons saved. Answering W's question, M says that Lawsons were good places to go when he had time.

##### *Synopsis: NNS's response*

In this part of the exchange, M fails to respond to utterance-final *ne* in W's utterance in an expectable manner.

##### *Data*

(From line 47 to line 57 in Appendix C)

1M: [(iya) ]:: rooson wa (1.2) boku o su-  
 well Lawson Top I O  
 2M: nankaika sukuttekureta kara ø.  
 some-times saved because  
 3W: un hah hah hah nankaika sukuttekureta no ø?  
 right sometimes saved Nom

4M: un.  
yes

5W: inochi o ø?  
life O

6M: n?

7W: inochi o ø?  
life O

8M: inochi tuuyorimo hora (1.0) hima na toki toka ø.  
life rather-than er free-time Cop when and-so-on

9W: a::::. hah hah hima- (.) soo da **ne::** =  
free-time so Cop ne

10M: = de nanka (.) sugoi kuseninatta no wa (1.0)  
and something very became-a-habit Nom Top

11M: yoru no juuji gurai ni::,  
night LK ten-o'clock around at

(gloss)

1/2M: We::ll because a Lawson saved me some times ø.  
3W: Right. (laughter) Did Lawson save you some times ø?  
4M: Yeah.  
5W: Saved your life ø?  
6M: n?  
7W: Saved your life ø?  
8M: Not my life but rather er (1.0) when I had time ø.  
9W: Right:::t. (laughter) When you had time- (.) That's right **ne::** =  
10/11M: = And er (.) what has become rather a habit is (1.0) at 10 o'clock at night,

### *Analysis*

W having explained in the preceding sequence that it is interesting for M to talk about Lawsons, in lines 1-2 M says that a Lawson saved him sometimes:

1M: [(iya) ]:: rooson wa (1.2) boku o su-  
well Lawson Top I O

2M: nankaika sukutte kureta kara ø.  
some-times saved because

1/2M: We::ll because a Lawson saved me sometimes ø.

He marks this utterance with *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded: he requires no particular response from W. This is because he

intends this utterance to be no more than his response to her thought.

W shows her understanding of it with *un* (Right), followed by laughter. She laughs here, probably because she thinks that M's choice of the verb *sukuu* 'save' sounds rather dramatic. She repeats the proposition contained in his utterance in lines 1-2, perhaps in an attempt to make sense of it:

3W: un      hah hah hah nankaika    sukuttezureta no ø?  
     right                                    sometimes saved                    Nom

3W: Right. (laughter) Did Lawson save you some times ø?

She produces this proposition probably because she thinks that this may be an interesting topic to develop. She marks the question with *zero* since the utterance type, a question, requires a matching second pair-part in the form of an answer.

Answering W's question, M offers confirmation with *un* (Yeah):

4M: un.  
     yes

4M: Yeah.

This brief response is probably not something W expected him to produce: it seems that he does not realise her intention. W then tries to develop the topic by asking him if it is his life that Lawson saved:

5W: inochi o ø?  
     life    O

5W: Your life ø?

That is to say, W's inquiry is metalinguistic and focused on his overdramatic use of *sukutte* (to save). She marks the question with *zero* since the utterance type, a question, requires a matching second pair-part in the form of an answer. It seems, however, that M



does not understand the question since he says *n?*:

6M: *n?*

6M: *n?*

Having noticed that M did not understand her question, W therefore repeats it:

7W: *inochi o ø?*  
life O

7W: Saved your life *ø?*

Finally understanding her question, M answers, saying that Lawson was convenient for killing time rather than saving his life:

8M: *inochi tuuyorimo hora (1.0) hima na toki toka ø.*  
life rather-than er free-time Cop when and-so-on

8M: Not my life but rather er (1.0) when I have nothing to do *ø*.

At this point, he uses *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded: he intends his utterance to be no more than his clarification of the proposition contained in his utterance in lines 1-2.

W then shows her understanding with *a::::* (Righ::::t) and laughs. This laughter shows her understanding that what he meant by the proposition contained in his utterance in lines 1-2, that a Lawson saved him, was not exciting at all. Her laughter is then followed by her acceptance *soo da* (That's right) of the proposition contained in M's utterance in line 8:

9W: *a::::. hah hah hima- (.) soo da ne::: =*  
free-time so Cop ne

9W: Righ::::t. (laughter) When you had time- (.) That's right *ne:::=*

She marks her acceptance with *ne*, which signals her intention that it should be treated as

a ground for the next proposition without further ado and directs M's acceptance. Her use of *ne* is more or less obligatory at this point: it is conventional for the speaker to mark an agreement (not a confirmation) of the addressee's opinion with *ne*, so as to strengthen their rapport.

M, however, does not show his acceptance of the force of *ne* in W's utterance in line 9, but simply starts a new proposition:

10M: = de nanka (.) sugoi kuseninatta no wa (1.0)  
and something very became-a-habit Nom Top

11M: yoru no juuji gurai ni::,  
night LK ten-o'clock around at

10/11M: = and er (.) what has become rather a habit is (1.0) at 10 o'clock at night,

His not showing his acceptance here is possibly unexpected: ignoring the force of *ne* in W's utterance is likely to jeopardise their rapport.

\*\*\*\*\*

The three extracts analysed above show ways in which M responds to *ne* in W's utterances. The first shows expectable responses to utterance-internal *ne* and to *ne* attached to a nominalized structure in W's utterances. The second and third show his probable failure to respond to utterance-internal *ne* and utterance-final *ne*. Although the lack of response in the second and third is perhaps very subtle, the lack of such a response causes the exchange to be somewhat awkward.

Having examined M's responses to *ne*-utterances, we will next examine his responses to *yo*-utterances in four extracts. The first extract will show an expectable response to a *yo*-utterance, and the others will show unexpected responses to *yo*-utterances.

#### 6.2.2.2.5 Extract 16 - An expectable response to a *yo*-utterance

##### *Synopsis: content*

In this part of the exchange, which overlaps the beginning of Extract 9, M and W are discussing whether the old *natto* on the table in his room should be thrown away.

##### *Synopsis: NNS's response*

In this part of the exchange, M responds in an expectable way to W's utterance in which *yo* occurs.

##### *Data*

(From line 1 to line 4 in Appendix C)

1M: *natto wa* (.) *hontoni*, (.)  
     *nattoo Top*       *really*

2W: *tabenai yo*..  
     *don't-eat yo*

3M: ***suteyoo***               ***ka ø***.  
     *dump-Volitional Q*

4W: *huh huh huh* (.) *u- doozo sutete ø*.  
                             *please dump-Request*  
(*gloss*)

1M: This *natto* (.) *really*, (.)

2W: I won't eat it *yo*..

3M: **Shall we throw it away ø?**

4W: (*laughter*) (.) Go on throw it away ø.

##### *Analysis*

M and W are talking about the *natto* on the table in the room where the conversation is taking place. M starts talking about the *natto*, saying 'This *natto* really', followed by a short pause:

1M: *natto wa* (.) *hontoni*, (.)  
      *nattoo Top*       *really*

1M: This *natto* (.) *really*, (.)

This pause probably indicates his need for processing time as he searches for an appropriate comment.

W, however, does not wait for him to produce a comment. Interrupting M's utterance, W says that she won't eat the *natto*:

2W: *tabenai yo*:.  
      *don't-eat yo*

2W: I won't eat it *yo*:.

At this point, she uses *yo*, intending the figure emerging in the talk to be grounded in the expectation that it is new to M or even controversial and also directing an assumptive response.

M then reacts to the force of *yo* in W's utterance in an expectable way, producing a preferred assumptive response that they should throw the *natto* away:

3M: *suteyoo ka* ø.  
      *dump-Volitional Q*

3M: Shall we throw it away ø?

He marks the suggestion with *zero* since the utterance type, a suggestion, requires a matching second pair-part in the form of an acceptance or rejection.

After M's suggestion, W laughs and encourages him to throw it away:

4W: *huh huh huh* (.) *u- doozo sutete* ø.  
      *please dump-Request*

4W: (laughter) (.) Go on throw it away ø.

\*\*\*\*\*

The above extract shows M's expectable response to W's utterance in which *yo* occurs. However, the three following extracts will show unexpected responses to utterances in which *yo* occurs.

#### 6.2.2.2.6 Extract 17 - Failure to respond to a *yo*-utterance (1)

##### *Synopsis: content*

This part of the exchange, which overlaps the beginning of Extract 8, begins with W's repeated utterances that she had to walk every day on the way to the university. M then starts talking about the situation which he experienced in Japan.

##### *Synopsis: NNS's responses*

In this part of the exchange, M fails to respond in an expectable way to W's utterance in which *yo* occurs.

##### *Data*

(From line 124 to line 130 in Appendix 3)

1W: = demo watashi mo eki made mainichi juugo fun aruiteta yo.  
but I also station to everyday fifteen minute walked yo

2: (0.5)

3M: n?

4W: eki made mainichi aruki datta yo.  
station to everyday walking was yo

5 (1.0)

6M: ore jitensha (0.5) pakureraretara,  
I bicycle is-stolen-Conditional

7W: un.  
uh-huh

(gloss)

1W: = But I also walked for fifteen minutes to the train station everyday yo.

2 (0.5)

3M: n?

4W: I walked to the station everyday yo.

5 (1.0)

6M: If I have my bicycle stolen,

7W: Uh-huh.

### *Analysis*

Having learnt in the preceding sequence that M lived at the top of the hill in Japan and therefore coming back was hard work, in line 1 W tells him how hard commuting to the university was for her: she says that she had a fifteen minute walk to the train station every day:

1W: = demo watashi mo eki made mainichi juugo fun aruiteta yo.  
but I also station to everyday fifteen minute walked yo

1W: = But I also had a fifteen minute walk to the train station every day yo.

She marks her utterance with *yo*, intending the figure emerging in the talk to be grounded in the expectation that it is new to M and also directing an assumptive response.

W's utterance is followed by a 0.5 second pause:

2: (0.5)

This pause probably indicates that she intends M to produce the assumptive response, perhaps an expression of his sympathy with W for the fact that she had a fifteen minute walk to the station for every day.

M, however, does not seem to understand W's utterance in line 1: he invites W to repeat with *n?*:

3M: n?

Having realised that M did not understand what she had said in line 1, W says that she walked to the train station every day:

4W: eki        made mainichi aruki    datta yo.  
     station to    everyday walking was    yo

4W: I walked to the station every day yo.

At this point, she uses *yo* again, intending the figure emerging in the talk to be grounded and also directing an assumptive response.

Her *yo*-utterance is followed by a one-second pause, which again indicates that she intends M to produce an assumptive response:

5    (1.0)

M, however, fails to produce an assumptive response, and starts talking about himself, saying that he would have to walk for twenty minutes if he had his bicycle stolen:

6M: ore jitensha (0.5) pakureraretara,  
     I    bicycle            is-stolen-Conditional

7W: un.  
     uh-huh

6M: If I have my bicycle stolen,  
7W: Uh-huh.

That is to say, he clearly fails to react to the force of *yo* in W's utterance in line 4. In other words, he deals only with the propositional property of W's utterance and not with the sequential one.

#### 6.2.2.2.7 Extract 18 - Failure to respond to a *yo*-utterance (2)

##### *Synopsis: content*

In this part of the exchange, which overlaps Extract 5 for the most part, W attempts to invite M to show his sympathy for the fact that commuting to her university in Japan is hard for her. However, his response is rather brisk.

##### *Synopsis: NNS's responses*

As in the above extract, in this part of the exchange, M fails to respond in an expectable way to W's utterance in which *yo* occurs.

##### *Data*

(From line 139 to line 142 in Appendix C)

1W: shiia made sanjuppun        na n    da **yo** aruku to.  
Shiia to    thirty-minutes Cop Nom Cop yo walk if

2M: **honto** ø.  
true

3W: tooku nai ø?  
far Neg

4M: tooi ø. =  
far

(gloss)

1W: It takes thirty minutes to Shiia **yo** - if I walk.

2M: **Really** ø.

3W: It's far, no ø?

4M: It's far ø. =

##### *Analysis*

In the talk leading up to this episode, M and W are trying to outdo each other in



boasting about how hard it is for them to commute to their universities. In this part of the exchange, W tells M how hard it was for her to commute to the university: she says that it takes thirty minutes from her house to a place called *Shiia*, marking the proposition with *yo*, intending the figure emerging in the talk to be grounded and also directing an assumptive response. The assumptive response she probably expects M to produce would be to show his sympathy.

1W: shiia made sanjuppun            na n   da **yo** aruku to.  
      Shiia to    thirty-minutes Cop Nom Cop yo walk if

1W: It takes thirty minutes to Shiia **yo** - if I walk.

She adds the proposition *aruku to* ‘if I walk’ as an afterthought.

However, her attempt with *yo*, fails. His response is rather curt - he just says *honto* (Really) with falling intonation, showing no interest in what she has just said:

2M: **honto** ø.  
      true

2M: **Really** ø.

At this point, he therefore uses *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded: he requires no particular response from W.

M’s blunt response in line 2 provokes W to ask for his agreement to the proposition that a thirty-minute walk is a long way with a negative tag question:

3W: tooku nai ø?  
      far    Neg

3W: It’s far, no ø?

W’s invitation is followed by M’s response *tooi* (far):

4M: tooi ø. =  
      far

4M: It’s far ø. =

He marks this utterance with *zero*, which sounds very blunt (see Extract 5 for the analysis of this use of *zero*).

\*\*\*\*\*

These two extracts illustrate M's failure to respond to W's *yo*-utterances. The following extract shows his failure to respond to his own *yo*-utterance.

#### 6.2.2.2.8 Extract 19 - Failure to respond to a *yo*-utterance (3)

##### *Synopsis: content*

This part of the exchange begins with W's utterance that she has the impression that there is only one train an hour in local areas. Having heard her comment, M says that what she has said concerns trains, implying that her utterance is inappropriate. He then changes the topic.

##### *Synopsis: NNS's responses*

In this part of the exchange, M does not respond expectably to his own utterance in which *yo* occurs.

##### *Data*

(From line 184 to line 189 in Appendix C)

1W: dakara: nanka: imeejitekini: (1.5) ichijikan ni ippon tte  
therefore something impressionally one-hour at one-train such-as

2W: imeeji ga aru: ø. =  
image S exist

3M: = densha wa soo da yo. =  
train Top so Cop yo

4W: = u::n.  
yes

5M: ore to dan- dan ku- ano:: ki- kinoo atta dan kun ø.  
I and Dan er yesterday met Dan Title

6W: u::n.  
yes

(gloss)

1/2W: So: er: I have an impression that there is only one train in an hour (in local areas) ø. =

3M: = That's a train, right, yø. =

4W: = Yea::h.

5M: I and Dan er: Dan you met yesterday ø.

6W: Ye::s.

### *Analysis*

To understand this part of the exchange, which occurs immediately after the exchange analysed in Extract 11, it is useful to review the wider context. In Extract 11, having heard that the bus service is poor in the city M lived in, W asks him if the train service is also poor. Answering her question, M says that the train service is not poor and that there is also an underground service. After this answer, W starts talking about what one of her friends told her, that students in rural areas prefer renting a room to spending an hour commuting when the train service is very poor. M then says that what W has said is about trains and that the underground is different. This utterance is followed by her expression of understanding (Righ:t) and then a 0.3 second pause.

The extract examined below starts after the pause: she says that she has the impression from her friend's story that there is only one train an hour in the county:

1W: dakara: nanka: imeejitekini: (1.5) ichijikan ni ippon tte  
therefore something impressionally one-hour at one-train such-as

2W: imeeji ga aru: ø. =  
image S exist

1/2W: So: er: I have an impression that there is only one train an hour (in local areas) ø. =

W probably feels obliged to say something to fill in the pause. She marks the utterance with *zero*, giving no indication as to how the figure emerging in the talk is to be grounded: she requires no particular response from M since she intends this utterance to be an extension of a more or less completed phrase in the conversation.

In a latched utterance, M says that what W has said about trains is right:

3M: = densha wa soo da **yo**. =  
       train Top so Cop yo

3M: = That's a train, right, **yo**. =

At this point he uses *yo*, which shows his intention that the utterance should be grounded and also directs an assumptive response. An assumptive response here would presumably be M's explanation about the underground service in the city.

W shows her understanding with *u::n* (Yea::h).

4W: = u::n.  
       yes

4W: = Yea::h.

Instead of explaining about the underground service, M then changes the topic, and starts talking about his friend:

5M: ore to dan- dan ku- ano:: ki- kinoo atta dan kun ø.  
       I and Dan er yesterday met Dan Title

6W: u::n.  
       yes

5M: I and Dan er: Dan you met yesterday ø.

6W: Ye::s.

That is to say, he fails to respond expectably to the force of *yo* in his own utterance. Alternatively, we might argue that the problem lies in the use of *yo* in line 3. If he does not intend to explain about the underground service in the city, he should have used *ne* or

*yone* rather than *yo*. By using *ne*, he could have invited W's acceptance of the proposition that the underground is different from the train, and then started a new topic. *Yone* could function in broadly the same way as *ne* does here, perhaps also representing himself as being more actively involved in the topic.

\*\*\*\*\*

The three extracts analysed above show M's unexpected responses to an utterance in which *yo* occurs. Specifically, the first and the second show his unexpected responses to W's *yo*-utterance, and the third shows his unexpected response to his own *yo*-utterance. These three extracts clearly show that such responses cause the exchange to be somewhat awkward.

## 6.5 Summary

The main purpose of this chapter was to understand and seek to explain why NSs feel awkward talking to NNSs in relation to NNS particle uses and NNS responses to the utterances in which the particles occur. To accomplish this, the Japanese talk-in-interaction data between an English male with a good command of Japanese and a Japanese female were analysed in detail, using interpretative research techniques.

The purpose was achieved by examining how the unexpectedness of the NNS's particle production and response strategies affected the NS's talk.

Firstly, the examination clearly demonstrated that the NS has problems at some places in the interaction because of the NNS's unexpected particle use. The reason why the NNS's unexpected particle use causes the NS's talk to become problematic is probably that the function of the particles is rather subtle in the sense that they do not have

propositional value, functioning instead as metapragmatic and metasequential markers. That is to say, the NNS's unexpected use of the particles does not directly influence the propositional value of the utterances in which they occur or fail to occur. Instead, it renders the exchange awkward in terms of sequentiality, either by causing the NS to misunderstand how the NNS intends the utterance to be responded to next, or by leaving the NNS's intentions unknown or unclear.

Secondly, the examination also clearly illustrates that the NNS's unexpected responses to the utterances in which the particles occur causes the NS to feel awkward. This is because the NNS's failure to respond expectably to the utterances in which the particles occur indicates that he does not understand how the NS intends her utterances to be responded to next.

What is important here is that it is the NS and not the NNS who feels awkward in NS-NNS interaction such as this: it may well be the case that the NNS felt that the exchange went well since he does not fully understand the functions of the particles and therefore does not realise that some of his uses of and responses to particles are unexpected.

Illustrating how the NNS in this study uses particles in expectable and unexpected ways in particular extracts of the talk data also enabled us to formulate a more precise prediction with regard to the NNS's particle use and the NNS's response to the particles.

With eleven extracts, this chapter initially illustrated NNS particle use. Firstly, the NNS studied seems able to use *ne* in expectable ways in a range of environments including utterance-final *ne* (Extract 1), utterance-internal *ne* (Extract 2), and *ne* attached to a nominalized structure (Extract 3).

Secondly, in order to improve his command of *ne*, this particular NNS needs to apply one convention currently absent from his repertoire, the convention that the speaker obligatorily marks his agreement with the addressee's opinion with *ne*, so as to intensify his rapport with his interlocutor (Extracts 4 and 5).

Thirdly, the NNS rarely uses *yo* in expectable ways. Or more precisely, he barely uses *yo* at all, favouring *zero* instead (Extracts 6, 7 and 8). This suggests that in comparison to *ne*, becoming competent in the use of *yo* is difficult, as noted by Oso (1986: 93). Although it was also the intention to examine the NNS's use of *yone*, there was no single occurrence of *yone* in his utterances although he used *yona*, a variant of *ne*, in an expectable way (Extract 9) as a part of the idiomatic expression *soo da yona*. It would therefore be premature to make any definite comment on his use of *yone*. There was however one case where he used *zero* at the point where *yone* would be more expectable (Extract 10). This may suggest that he is not competent in the use of *yone*. There was also one case in which the NNS used *zero* at the point where a choice of any of *ne*, *yo* or *yone* would have been more expectable (Extract 11). This extract, as well as some of the previous ones, clearly indicates that he does not choose *zero* intentionally and strategically, but rather that he fails to choose an expectable particle, resulting in unexpected uses of *zero*. Since the use of *zero* conventionally suggests that the speaker does not expect a response to what has said, this causes a problem in some places.

After the examination of the NNS's use of particles, this chapter then illustrated the NNS's responses to utterances in which the particles occur, in eight extracts. As in his production of the particles, the examination of the talk data also enabled us to suggest a more precise prediction with regard to NNS responses to particles. Firstly, the NNS responded expectably to utterance-final *ne* (Extract 12), utterance-internal *ne* and *ne*

attached to a nominalized structure (Extract 13). This suggests that, like his active use of *ne*, he is fairly competent at responding to various uses of *ne*, although on occasion he did fail to produce expectable responses to utterances/information units in which *ne* occurred (Extracts 14 and 15). As with his lack of use of *yo*, he seemed also to have problems with responding to *yo* (Extracts 17, 18 and 19) - there was only one case in the three examined where he responded expectably to an utterance in which *yo* occurred (Extract 16).

Having examined the NNS's use of and response to the particles in 19 extracts in total, we can argue that although the NNS is exceptionally competent at the syntactic, semantic, and phonological levels, he is not fully competent at the pragmatic and sequential levels, at least with regard to the particles *ne*, *yo* and *yone*.

This chapter also strengthens the validity of the PFH in the sense that when a NS is talking to a NNS who does not produce or respond competently to the particles, she cannot interact competently herself: the NS's talk thus becomes problematic after the NNS's unexpected use of particles and the NNS's unexpected response to utterances in which particles occur since such unexpectable uses by the NNS fail to provide the NS with appropriate pragmatic and sequential instructions.

A pedagogic implication of this chapter is that even a NNS who has an excellent command of the language and has had a reasonable period of exposure in the country among NSs still has difficulties with the particles, so that the unexpectedness of the NNS's talk creates problems in interaction. The reason why the NNS examined in this chapter still had difficulties with the particles could be the fact that his native language, English, does not have the same kind of particles. Therefore, to take the simplest case, a *zero* marked utterance in Japanese has a very different pragmatic meaning and sequential function from a *zero* marked utterance in English, where *zero* is of course the default. It



would therefore be helpful to examine in future studies how NNSs whose native languages have the same kind of particles as the Japanese sentence-final particles *ne*, *yo* and *yone* use these particles and also how they respond to the utterances in which such particles occur.

## CHAPTER 7

### CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

#### 7.1 Introduction

This final chapter completes the present investigation by answering the following three questions:

- (a) Did the present study achieve its original research purposes?
- (b) How was the present study distinctive from earlier studies?
- (c) Can the findings of the present study be related to broader issues?

#### 7.2 The extent to which the present study achieved its original research purposes

The present study investigated the Japanese sentence-final particles *ne*, *yo* and *yone*, as one of basic pragmatic tools that are hard both for language instructors to teach and for language learners to understand and use. It had two principal objectives, (i) to propose and test a hypothesis to account for the use of this sub-set of Japanese sentence-final particles, and (ii) to explain the ‘awkwardness’ NSs feel in interacting with NNSs in relation to particle use.

The above two purposes were successfully achieved:

**Chapter Two** proposed an original hypothesis, the PFH, capable of accounting

for the functions of the particles from a rationalistic perspective. In the hypothesis, the particles were considered to have pragmatic properties associated with the figure/ground *gestalt* and also have derived sequential functions relating to their interactional occurrence.

Following **Chapter Three**, in which methodological issues were discussed, **Chapter Four** demonstrated the validity of the PFH through the analysis of an *unmarked* talk-in-interaction type, by examining how the particles were used and how the utterances in which the particles occurred were responded to in an ‘everyday’ conversation involving two female native Japanese speakers. In addition to their utterance-final function, the chapter also explained several different particle uses, including their use utterance-internally, utterance-independently and when attached to nominalized structures. In all these cases the use of the particles was accounted for by the PFH.

**Chapter Five** demonstrated the validity of the PFH through the analysis of a goal-oriented talk type, a radio phone-in exchange involving a caller and a host. Thus the researcher also tested the explanatory adequacy of the PFH in a *marked* talk-in-interaction. The analysis revealed that the participants’ strategic use of particles in the marked talk type was also consistent with the prediction of the PFH.

**Chapter Six** successfully illustrated the ‘awkwardness’ NSs feel in talking to NNSs with respect to the use of particles, by examining both expectable and unexpected uses of particles and responses to them in an instance of ‘everyday’ talk involving a female native speaker and a male non-native speaker. This analysis clearly showed that the PFH was necessary in order to explain why lack of expectability in NNS particle use caused problems for the NS.

### **7.3 How the present study is distinctive from earlier studies**

There are at least four respects in which the present research is distinctive in relation to the alternatives approaches employed in previous studies.

#### **7.3.1 The sequential function of the particles**

Although earlier studies also treat the particles as pragmatic markers, the account of the pragmatic properties of the particles proposed in the PFH is to be preferred because the present research has argued that the particles have pragmatic properties associated with the notion of the figure and ground, thereby implying their sequential function. In contrast to earlier studies, in recognising their function in talk-in-interaction, the present study has also succeeded in providing an explanation of why the particles occur only in interaction: interactants repeatedly use the particles in Japanese talk-in-interaction so as to prompt addressees to continue in particular ways, thus indicating to addressees how the speaker's utterances are expected to be responded to.

#### **7.3.2 Extended talk-in-interaction**

There are surprisingly few studies which appreciate that talk-in-interaction is consequentiality or outcome oriented. In contrast, the present study has examined how the particles are related to the development of talk-in-interaction and its outcome-directed orientation: in order to test the validity of the PFH proposed in the present study, micro level analysis has shown that the particles and the responses to utterances in which the particles occur in both unmarked and marked types of talk-in-interaction are consequentiality oriented. This analysis has successfully shown that the particles

play a vital role in managing the trajectory of talk.

### **7.3.3 Naturally occurring talk-in-interaction data**

Unlike most earlier studies of the particles, in which invented examples, or examples taken for novels or TV dramas are used for analysis, the present study used naturally occurring talk-in-interaction data to test the validity of the hypotheses. This is because the way language works in reality is far more complicated than we think, being influenced by social, psychological, and cognitive factors. From these reasons, the present study was interested in the actual occurrence of the particles and not in how we think the particles occur. As anyone who has tried will know, analyzing naturally-occurring talk-in-interaction data is very demanding. However, the present study confirms that it is the only and best way to examine and understand phenomena such as sentence-final particles and their function in real talk-in-interaction.

### **7.3.4 NNS talk**

The use of NNS empirical talk data is also one of the characteristics of the present study. Although some studies refer to NNS particle use anecdotally, so far as the researcher is aware, no other study deals with NNS particle use in natural talk. Since it was motivated partly by pedagogic considerations, the present study necessarily involved an examination of NNS use of particles and NNS response to utterances in which the particles occur. As shown in Chapter Six, the present study successfully accounted for the awkwardness experienced by NSs in interactions with NNSs with respect to the use of sentence-final particles.

## **7.4 The findings of the present study in relation to broader issues**

This section considers how the findings of the present study may relate to more general and fundamental disciplinary frameworks than those directly investigated or explored in study itself. As a result, some further investigations are also recommended.

### **7.4.1 Implications for pragmatics**

The present study has at least three implications for the field of pragmatics.

Firstly, the present study has shown that the pragmatic properties and sequential functions of the particles are interrelated and that the particles cannot be fully understood unless both phenomena are studied together. This implies that pragmatic and sequential phenomena should not be treated as discrete, at least as a default position, and that studies of natural language pragmatics probably need to take sequential function into account. This may be especially true when illocutionary force is studied: it is rarely possible fully to understand the illocutionary force of a particular utterance if its sequential context is ignored. Thus, speech act theory, which has a strong tendency to limit the study of ‘utterance interpretation’ to discrete, idealized examples or even to imagined examples, as in discourse completion tests, needs to consider natural sequential context in order to account more persuasively for the illocutionary force associated with utterances.

Secondly, the field studied in this thesis is principally Japanese discourse pragmatics. Thus the micro level analysis of the use of sentence final particles in naturally occurring talk-in-interaction reveals not only the interdependence of their pragmatic properties and sequential functions, as discussed in the previous paragraph,

but also illustrates the role of pragmatics in discourse, a perspective that has not always been fully acknowledged in the rationalistic tradition. The more holistic understanding associated with empirical pragmatics is therefore upheld by this study, which demonstrates the way in which sentence final particles are profoundly integrated into Japanese talk-in-interaction. Thus no element of talk-in-interaction can be adequately accounted for in a study of discrete features since each element is organically connected to others and no study or set of studies of single utterances can hope to provide a complete illustration of the nature of discourse level language use.

Thirdly, the present study has shown that the notion of figure and ground can be applied at a discourse level by illustrating that the particles *ne* and *yo* signal whether the utterance in which the particle occurs is to be treated as unaccented or salient in the on-going exchange. Phenomena of this kind may not be unique to Japanese, and it would not be surprising if many other languages encoded such a distinction at the discourse level, using the same or different means. This is because overt indications of the status of contributions to talk with respect with their figure/ground status make it easier for the addressee to understand how a particular utterance should be related to the previous or/and following utterances. This may suggest that studies of pragmatics could profitably adopt a more cognitively motivated position.

#### **7.4.2 Implications for our understanding of talk-in-interaction**

In the previous sub-section, it was noted that it is rarely possible fully to understand the illocutionary force of a particular utterance if its sequential context is ignored. Although it is not always seemed so obvious in CA, it is equally the case that it

is rarely possible to understand sequentiality fully if the pragmatic function of utterances is ignored, as will be argued below.

The present study shows what people do with turns in Japanese talk-in-interaction: the speaker provides the addressee with an explicit sign as to what kind of response is expected in the next turn, by means of sentence-final particles. Because these findings show the pragmatic relationship between utterances, they also suggest the value of expanding the notion of method such as *turn* from 'when and how people take turns' to 'what people do with turns', thus adopting a more pragmatic stance. The phenomenon of turn-taking has been extensively researched in the CA framework whose main interest is in the ways turn-taking is organized. However, as far as the investigator knows, there are no studies which investigate principally how people indicate the kind of response expected in the next turn, apart from studies of adjacency pair-parts.

In this respect, the present study shows what pragmatics could possibly offer CA. Minimally, this study shows that turn-taking is not purely structural since next contributions are constrained by the need to accept or reject the force of the sentence final particle of the previous turn. Thus CA alone cannot predict the types of next-turn contribution that sentence final particles prompt. Taking this insight one step further, the investigator hopes that this study opens up for the possibility of constructing an explanatory/predictive framework for CA. This is because the micro-analysis of the pragmatic particles not only enables us to make strong predictions about the conversational behaviour of the participants studied here as they engage in student-student small-talk or play out the roles of game-show host and contestant, but in principle also enables us to predict the characteristic talk behaviours associated with



other social roles (politicians, salespeople, etc.). In following the no *a priori* assumption approach associated with ethnomethodology, CA theory necessarily represents turn taking as merely structural whereas, as this thesis shows, it is clearly motivated. Also, while pragmatics involves the study of role relationships, CA analysis has traditionally disallowed role knowledge as a motivation. In contrast, this thesis has shown how explanations in CA could be more persuasive if it acknowledged the way in which speakers encode perceptions of role and recognized that it is necessary to take into account ‘what people do with turns’ as well as ‘when and how people take turns’ in explaining talk-in-interaction. Thus, by accepting the mainstream tradition of pragmatics, as most obviously revealed in speech act theory, where intention is acknowledged as a motivation. CA theory could become more powerful and convincing.

There also appear to be cultural differences among languages as to ‘what people do with turns’: some cultures for the most part leave next-turn procedures to be inferred by the next speaker and some give clear indications of what is expected. Japanese very obviously falls into the second category and English probably falls into the first. It would thus be useful to research (1) the extent to which other languages have either explicit or implicit turn control mechanisms/expectations and how these are encoded or inferred, and (2) the limit to the ways that talk might be structured in this respect.

### **7.4.3 Implications for research methodology**

The findings of the present study have at least two implications for research methodology.

The first concerns the generalizability of qualitative methodology. As previously mentioned in Chapter Three (pp.73-74), the generalizability of qualitative methodology

is frequently questioned. The reason is that its findings are based on a small number of cases chosen from a large number of potential cases. However, the investigator expects that the way the present study was conducted with the three complementary sources of data enabled him to suggest that qualitative methodology is not always open to the criticism that it cannot account for data other than those which occur in the immediate case/s studied. That is to say, although it is always useful to test the PFH further with other 'marked' talk types, it is strongly expected that the PFH will survive such tests based on the way the examination of the three different talk types tested it in the present study was conducted.

The second implication is for rationalistic/empirical pragmatic debate. The investigator expected the approach followed in this investigation to be an attempt to bring together rationalistic and empirical pragmatic methods. The combination of these methods was shown to be beneficial to the present study, allowing the investigator to exercise his rational intuition as a native speaker of the language to set up a hypothesis, and then turn to empirical observation to test its validity. This study therefore suggests that the combination of rationalistic and empirical approaches is likely to be well suited to other areas that are usually studied within either a rationalistic pragmatics or a CA methodology.

#### **7.4.4 Implications for TJFL**

The main contribution the present study has for TJFL is its account of the functions of the particles *ne* and *yo*, which may be useful in improving the descriptions of the particles in TJFL materials. The PFH, whose validity was demonstrated through the analysis of empirical data, clearly explains what kind of pragmatic meanings the

speaker can encode with the particles and what kind of effects occur as the result of their uses.

As well as *ne* and *yo*, the present study was also able to account for the function of *yone*, which is hardly referred to in TJFL materials. Although it is not generally taught in TJFL, there is no rational reason why it should not be, given its regular occurrence in talk-in-interaction and the important function it plays.

Furthermore, the analysis of the data showed the important function of *zero* particle use in talk-in-interaction and its pragmatic and sequential meanings in conversation. This suggests that the present situation in TJFL, namely that the function of *zero* in talk-in-interaction is not taught, should be reconsidered, especially given that likelihood that learners unfamiliar with sentence-final particles will regard *zero* as an unmarked position.

In addition to the descriptions of *zero*, *ne*, *yo* and *yone*, the qualitative data analysis in the present research also revealed an association between accounts and account giving and the particles *ne* and *yo* when attached to nominal structures. This finding seems to be immediately applicable to TJFL. It also functions as a clear instance of discourse grammar and of how such grammar is useful for both teachers and learners; even though the importance of communicative ability has been advocated in the last two decades in TJFL, the focus is still largely on the language at a sentence level and thus fails to recognize the importance of discourse grammar - the grammar which goes beyond single isolated sentences. In this respect, this finding, which was observed by chance, is also valuable.

Last of all, the achievement of the present study clearly shows that the research methods employed in the study were appropriate to interactive particles. This suggests

that equally revealing results can be obtained from the investigation of other Japanese particles by similar methods.

## APPENDIX A

### Transcription of an Unmarked Talk-in-Interaction Type

#### Analysed in Chapter 4

E: Etsuko

M: Miki

1E: machiko ga iru tokini, =  
Machiko S exist when

2M: = u[n.]  
uh-huh

3E: [to]nton tte (.) tataku wake **yo**.  
knock-knock QT knock Nom yo

4M: UN. =  
uh-huh

5E: = de watashi moo mayonaka da shi **ne** ichiji sugi  
and I already midnight Cop because ne one-oclock past

6E: da shi, =  
Cop because

7M: = UN. =  
uh-huh

8E: = de kowai kara sa (.) who are you toka tte,  
and scared because IP who are you or-something QT

9M: huh huh huh huh huh [huh]

10E: [who] is it toka tte itta no ka **na**: watashi.  
who is it or-something QT said Nom Q IP I

11E: .hh de sa nanka (.) tsu- me toka tte iu no **ne**:. =  
and IP something me or-something QT say Nom ne

12M: = un.  
uh-huh

13E: .hh mii ja: wakannai [jan ø.]  
me with-Top don't-know Tag

14M: [huh ] huh huh huh huh [huh] huh huh huh

15E: [de,]  
and

16E: so say your name toka tte it[tara ] sa:,  
so say your name or-something QT when-said IP

17M: [(un.)]  
uh-huh

18E .hh nanka iwanai saigo made iwanai no **yo**.  
something doesn't-say last until doesn't-say Nom yo

19M: un.  
uh-huh

20E: de shooganai kara aketa no **ne**.  
and no-choice because opened Nom ne

21E: so shitara ikinari **ne** a- nante itta to omoo ø?  
so when-did suddenly ne what said Comp think

22E: you are so rude tte iu no **yo**.  
you are so rude QT say Nom yo

23M: huh huh huh

24E: na- nande tte,  
why QT

25M: un. un. un.  
yeah yeah yeah

26 (0.5)

27E: kaesana- da- konna **ne**:,  
like-this ne

28M: heh

29E: kogitanai **ne**:,  
crummy ne

30M: huh [huh huh huh ]

31E: [doraibaa ] o kaesanai dake de **ne**:,  
screwdriver O don't-return only because ne

32E: nande atashi ga rude na no [sa: ] tte,  
why I S rude Cop Nom IP QT

33M: [u:n.]  
right

34E: .hh atashi wa koko ni hitoride ite kowai no **yo** tte,  
I Top here at by-myself exist scared Nom yo QT

35M: huh huh huh huh =

36E: = **ne**. (.) namae o kakuninsuru no wa toozen deshoo **ø**?  
ne name O identify Nom Top natural Tag

37M: un.  
yeah

38E: tte yutte [heh heh] heh heh heh sugoi nanka okotten no **ø**.  
QT said very something angry Nom

39M: [huh huh]

40M: ( ) okotta no **ø**? (.) nanka sugu kaeshite **ne** to wa  
got-angry Nom something soon return-Request ne QT Top

41M: itteta kedo sa:.  
said though IP

42E: nande nan[de,]  
why why

43M: [( ] ) itteta **yo**: toka itte.  
said yo or-something said

44E: doraibaa gotoki de piripirisuru wake **ø**?  
screwdriver like with is-irritated Nom

45M: .hh nanka **ne**: kekkoo komakasoo na kanji  
something ne quite seem-stingy Cop impression

46M: dearu kedo kare mo **ø**.  
Cop though he also

47E: demo, (1.0)  
but

48E: sonna are nani aitsu nitotte  
such that what him for

49E: inochizuna na no **ø**?  
lifeline Cop Nom

50 (.)

51E: [( ] )]

52M: [huh huh huh datte are wa ( )] kankoku kara mottekita  
because that Top Korea from brought

53M: gurai dakara sa:.  
extent because IP

54E: dakedo are ichi pondo gurai de kaeru yan [sokorahen de Ø.]  
 but that one pound about with can-buy Tag everywhere at

55M: [hah hah hah hah ]

56M: hah [hah ]

57E: [ichi] pondo shoppu de sa:. =  
 one pound shop at IP

58M: = kaeru to omoo Ø. [( )]  
 can-buy Comp think

59E: [kaeru] deshoo Ø? =  
 can-buy Tag

60M: = ( )

61E: ( )

62M: u:n. hah [hah hah hah ]  
 yeah

63E: [nanka ano:] (.) sorede nanka **ne**: sonoato **ne**  
 something er and-then something ne after-that ne

64E: I am disappointed toka iu wake Ø.  
 I am disappointed or-something say Nom

65 (0.5)

66M: uso:: Ø! =  
 lie

67E: = nani o dakara sa what do you expect da **yone** soshitara.  
 what O therefore IP what do you expect Cop yone if-so

68E: hah hah hah [hah ]

69M: [demo] nan te iu ka (.) maa nanka (.) are nanka  
 but what QT say Q well something that something

70M: koo (.) bimyoo na hyoogen ga dekitenai  
 er subtle Cop expression S can't-do

71M: [( ) hah hah hah hah hah hah hah hah eigo de Ø. hah hah hah hah]  
 English in

72E: [deki- hah hah hah hah hah hah hah hah hah hah hah hah hah ]

73E: ( ) disappointed-o-suru tte iu ijoo wa (.) nanika expectation  
 to-be-disappointed QT say since Top some-kind-of expectation

74E: ga [aru wake deshoo Ø? hah hah hah]  
 S have Nom Tag



75M: [( ) soo da **yone**. u::n::.. ] anata motto ii ko da to  
so Cop yone yeah you more good person cop Comp

76M: omotta toka **ne**. heh heh heh hah hah hah  
thought or-something ne

77E: sonna no sore wa omae ga  
such Nom that Top you S

78E: machigatte[iru zo ( ) omae no (nanka) kanchigai da **yo** mitai na **ø**.]  
be-wrong IP you LK something misjudgement Cop yo like Cop

79M: [huh huh huh so: so: so: **ø** huh huh huh huh huh huh huh huh]  
so so so

80M: dakara kekkyoku anmari i- n: sooiu nanka bimyo na hyoogen  
therefore after-all very er such something subtle Cop expression

81M: ga dekitenakatta dake janai tabun **ø**.  
S couldn't-do only Tag probably

82E: soo na no ka **na**[::.]  
so Cop Nom Q na

83M: [.hh] .hh wakannai kedo **ø**.  
don't-know though

84 (1.0)

85?: un.  
yeah

86 (2.0)

87M: nanka kinoo sa: hora moo hotondo kankokujin no hito de  
something yesterday IP er Int almost Koreans LK people and

88M: maa igirisujin no nanninka kiteta n dakedo,  
er English LK some-people were-there Nom though

89E: un.  
uh-huh

90M: de hitori sa nanka:, =  
and one-person IP something

91E: = sakki deta no dare **ø**? danna **ø**?  
just-before picked-up-the-phone person who husband

92 (0.8)

93M: a so so so [danna san **ø**.]  
oh so so so husband Title

94E: [hee:. ]  
really

95M: un sugoi danna wa ii hito yo:.  
yeah very husband Top good person yo

96 (0.8)

97M: nanka (1.0) un (1.0) nanka yasashi soo da shi odayaka  
something yes something kind seem Cop because calm

98M: da sh[i,]  
Cop because

99E: [un] so- soo da yo:ne:.  
yeah so Cop yone

100M: u::n. =  
yeah

101E: = na- nanka denwa no kanji demo soo dat[ta 0.]  
something telephone LK impression even so was

102M: [so ]o yaro 0.  
so Tag

103M: u:n soo na n yo. kare wa sugoi nanka yosasoo na hito 0.  
yeah so Cop Nom yo he Top very something seems-good Cop person

104E: u::n.  
yeah

105 (1.0)

106M: nanka hora minna kurisuchan da kara sa:,  
something er everyone Christians Cop because IP

107E: u::n.  
yeah

108M: warito ma- maa odayaka da ne.  
rather fairly calm Cop ne

109E: fu::n.  
right

110M: de:.,  
and

111E: un.  
uh-huh

112M: anmari hora koo (.) kitanai kanji no ojisan demonai shi,  
very er er dirty impression LK a-old-man Cop-Neg because

113E: huh huh huh [hah hah hah heh heh heh nanka hah hah hah ]  
something

114M: (( ) machiko ni tsuzuite machiko no oya ni tsuzuite ø]  
Machiko to follow Machiko LK parent to follow

115E: nanka ne nanka yoppodo nanka atta no ø? moshikashite  
something ne something very something happened Nom possibly

116E: kitanai ojisan (( ) ipp]ai mitekita wake ø?  
dirty man many saw Nom

117M: [hah hah hah ie ie ie ie.]  
no no no no

118M: ie ie ie ie datte hora (.) nanka  
no no no no because er something

119M: koo wakareru yone: yappa  
er branch-off yone expectedly

120M: gojuudai gurai ni naru to sa: otoko no hito tte.  
fifties around to become when IP men LK person Top

121 (0.8)

122M: sugoi kitanai rosen ni iku ka,  
very dirty route to go Q

123E: huh (laughter)

124M: kirei na kirei na (( ))  
clean Cop clean Cop

125E: [demo] kitanai hito tte gojuu ni  
but dirty person Top fifties to

126E: ikanaku temo kitanai deshoo ø?  
doesn't-reach even dirty Tag

127M: hah hah hah [hah]

128E: [moo] sanjuu gurai kara moo su[deni, ]  
already thirties around from Intensifier already

129M: [hah hah ] hah

130M: [soo kamoshinnai ø.]  
so might

131E: [moo:: ] yosootsuku yo. =  
Intensifier can-guess yo

132M: = hah are wa:: hah hah hah  
that Top

133M: yosootsuku **ne**:: =  
can-guess ne

134E: = u:[n.]  
yeah

135M: [ta]shikani **o**.  
surely

136 (1.0)

137M: u:[n.]  
yeah

138E: [ni]juudai no wakai yatsu wa **ne**:: ano:  
twenties LK young men Top ne er

139E: wakai hito demo i:- soo naru yatsu wa iru **ne**.  
young person even so become men Top exist ne

140M: soo **ne**::  
so ne

141E: un.  
yeah

142M: kitanai hito wa motomoto kitanai kara **o**.  
dirty person Top originally scruffy because

143 (1.0)

144M: wakannai kedo **o**.  
don't-know though

145 (.)

146M: sorede maa:: un (.) maa sugoi ii hito na no **ne**. (.)  
then er yes er very good person Cop Nom ne

147M: .hh dakara zenzen itemo  
therefore at-all even-when-exist

148M: a: iru no tte kanji de,  
oh exist Nom QT impression and

149E: e musuko mo (Daramu) ni kiteru no **o**?  
oh son too Durham to is-here Nom

150M: musume:::: wa musume wa sannin iru desho a futari  
daughter Top daughter Top three-people exist Tag oh two-people

151M: iru desho[o **o**.]  
exist Tag

- 152E: [fu ]:[n.]  
right
- 153M: [mu]suko ga hitori deshoo ø. .hh musume no  
son S one-person Tag daughter LK
- 154M: hitori no hoo wa mada anoo mada kaette chuuka kiko-  
one-person LK part Top not-yet er not-yet return I-mean
- 155M: kotoshi wa kaettekonnai mitai ø. (.) oosutoria ni (.) iru ( )  
this-year Top won't-return seem Austria in exist
- 156E: fu:n (nani) benkyoushiteiru n da kke ø? sannin tomo.  
right what is-studying Nom Cop Q three-people all
- 157M: mada sannin tomo gakusei de (.) ichibanue ga ongaku:  
still three-people all student and oldest S music
- 158M: (1.0) oosutoria ni aru ongakugakkoo mitai na (.) no de  
Austria in exist music-school like Cop one and
- 159M: nani o yatteru ka wasurechatta n da kedo nanika  
what O is-doing Q forgot Nom Cop but something
- 160M: gakki o yatteru no ne kurashikku no.  
music-instrument O is-doing Nom ne classic LK
- 161E: hee: nanka sugoi are moshikashite uiin no ko- ano  
really something very that possibly Vienna LK er
- 162E: ongetsu ongaku gakuin toka sonna toko ø?  
music school or-something such place
- 163M: ja- nan no wakannai ø. (.) demo sooiu toko da to  
what LK don't-know but such place Cop Comp
- 164M: [omoo ø. (.) rokunenkan to] ka itte, (.)  
think for-six-years or-something go-and
- 165E: [e nani yatteru no gakki ø?]  
er what is-doing Nom music-instrument
- 166M: iya honto wa juunenkan no koosu na n da tte ø.  
no truth Top for-ten-years LK course Cop Nom Cop QT
- 167 (.)
- 168E: e:: [ja, ]  
wow then
- 169M: [aaiu] no tte juunen toka iku n da tte ø. =  
that-kind-of one Top ten-years or-something go Nom Cop QT
- 170E: = a ja moo are kana: ja- chuugaku kookoo gurai  
oh then Int that I-wonder then junior-high-school high-school about

171E: kara moo yatteiru no ka ø.  
from already is-doing Nom Q

172M: juu::[:dai kara haitteiru] to omoo ø. un juudai kara  
teenager from enter Comp think yes teenager from

173E: [( )]

174M: haitteiru n da to omoo ø. de juu- dakara kookoo  
enter Nom Cop Comp think and ten therefore high-school

175M: sotsugyooshita [ato janai tabun ø.]  
graduated after Tag probably

176E: [ja: kanemochi da] ne:?  
then rich Cop ne

177M: kanemochi da yo::. =  
rich Cop yo

178E: = .hh datte sa nihonjin demo tamani hora  
because IP Japanese-people also occasionally er

179E: ondaisei de ryuugakusuru hito iru kedo sa: (1.0)  
music-university-student and study-abroad person exist but IP

180E: okane nai to ne:: (.) ika- ikaserarenai yo::. =  
money don't-have if ne can't-let-(someone)-go

181M: = soo da [yone. nanzenman tte kakaru janai ø?. u::n]  
so Cop yone ten-millions as-much-as cost Tag uh-huh

182E: [u::n datte sagishira yuuko tte]iu sa:  
yeah because Sagishira Yuuko called IP

183E: yuumei na hora [sopu]rano shinga:: shitteru ø?  
famous Cop er soprano singer know

184M: [un. ]  
uh-huh

185M: a sopurano no hito ø?  
oh soprano LK person

186E: tamani hora NHK de  
occasionally er Japan-Broadcasting-Corporation at

187E: anoo nanka yatteru ø.  
er something perform

188M: wakannai ø.  
don't-know

189E: de sono hito mo ne: geidai dete .hh (.) anoo  
and that person also ne art-university graduated-and er

- 190E: dokka ryuugakushita n da yone. [de ] nanka ne uchi-no-haha  
somewhere studied-abroad Nom Cop yone and something ne my-mother
- 191M: [un.]  
uh-huh
- 192E: ga fan club ni haitteru no (ne:).  
S fan club to be-a-member Nom ne
- 193E: [jitsu wa hah hah hah watashi to onaji gurai no toshi na noni ne.  
fact Top I and same about LK age Cop though ne
- 194M: [hah hah hah hah huh huh huh (
- 195E: huh huh huh .hh .hh watashi no ni hairanai noni( )]  
I one to doesn't-join though
- 196M: )]
- 197E: tsukure[chuuni oya dattara .].  
make-Order parent Cop-Conditional
- 198M: [hee::::: ] huh hah hah [hah hah]  
right
- 199E: [sore ]de  
and-then
- 200E: nanka ne [( )]  
something ne
- 201M: [na- nan no] nani o yaru no ? nani o rokuonshite  
what one what O do Nom what O record
- 202M: yorokoba- a nani o shite fan o yorokobasu no ?  
fan oh what O do fan O please Nom
- 203E: e nan daro na:. =  
er what I-wonder na
- 204M: = huh hah [hah hah hah hah ( ) wa ?]  
Top
- 205E: [chotto matte ne. (.) u::n. ] talk ka na:.  
little wait-Request ne er talk Q na
- 206M: talk [hah hah hah .hh .hh .hh talk show .].  
talk talk show
- 207E: [.hh hah hah anoo ] kooenkai  
er public-performance
- 208E: demo[: shiyoo .].  
or-something do-Volitional

209M: [er:: ] Tanaka Etsuko talk show mi[tai na ø.]  
Tanaka Etsuko talk show like Cop

210E: [soo ] soo  
yeah yeah

211E: nani o hanase tte ø. =  
what O speak-Order QT

212M: = huh huh huh =

213E: = chotto komaru n dakedo ø. [hah hah hah hah hah hah hah  
little am-in-trouble Nom but

214M: [hah hah hah hah hah hah hah

215E: hah hah hah hah hah hah watashi] no igirisu shippai ( )  
I LK UK failure

216M: hah hah hah hah hah hah hah hah]

217M: shippai dan,  
failure talk

218E: keiken dan mitai na ø.  
experience story like Cop

219M: igirisu amerika (.) hooroo ki [mitai na ø. hah hah hah]  
the-UK the-USA vagabond-life story like Cop

220E: [hoorooki ø. hah hah hah] hah hah  
vagabond-life

221E: hah hah hah tochuude nihon mo chotto hairimashita [mitai na ø.]  
on-the-way Japan also little dropped-in like Cop

222M: [so so ]  
so so

223M: so ø. (.) tochuude nihon ni kaettekite toka ø.  
so on-the-way Japan to come-back or-something

224 (0.5)

225M: ne. [heh heh heh (demo) ] demo sa: mo e demo nijikan toka  
ne but but IP Int er but two-hours about

226E: [demo hoorooki (tte,)]  
but vagabond-life Top

227M: de owannai yone.  
within doesn't-finish yone

228 (1.5)



229M: sore hanashi dasu to Ø. =  
that talk start if

230E: = a owannai (yo).  
oh doesn't-finish yo

231M: hah hah hah [hah hah ( )]

232E: [huh huh watashi tamani dakara ne:] kurasu demo  
I sometimes therefore ne class even

233E: hanashidashite ne sooiu kudaranai hora nanka kekkoo  
start-talking-and ne such trivial er something quite

234E: yorokobu janai [mata] ( ) gakusei ga sa:.  
enjoy Tag Intensifier students S IP

235M: [un. ]  
uh-huh

236M: un.  
yeah

237E: de: daigaku demo sa sooiu no (.) chotto hanashi dasu to  
and university even IP such one little talk start when

238E: minna ga hore patto okiru no [ne. ]  
everyone S look suddenly wake-up Nom ne

239M: [huh ] hah hah hah hah hah [( )]

240E: [nemu]  
sleepy

241E: soo na kao de patto nanka okiru no ne. (.) sorede  
seem Cop face with suddenly something wake-up Nom ne and

242E: nanka kocchi mo chooshizuite janai kedo nanka ne  
something this-side also get-carried-away Cop-Neg but something ne

243E: tomannai toki aru ne: kyuujuppun hanashita koto  
can't-stop time exist ne ninety-minutes talked experience

244E: aru mon Ø.  
exist Intensifier

245M: e::::! yabai ne:.  
really chancy ne

246E: demo soredemo (.) nanka ne gakusei ni yotte wa .hh daraka ne  
but even-so something ne student on depend Top therefore ne

247E: honto kurasu ni yoru no yo.  
really class on depend Nom yo

248M: [un.]  
uh-huh

249E: [de ] **ne** honto nani (.) shooganai koto hanashitenjane **yo**  
and ne really what trivial matter don't-talk-Order yo

250E: [tte] kao de kiiteru yatsu mo- no- kurasu mo iru wake **ø**.  
such-as face with are-listening people class also exist Nom

251M: [un.]  
uh-huh

252M: un. u:n.  
uh-huh right

253E: demo watashi wa ha- shaberitai kara shabe[ru shaberu n  
but I Top want-to-talk because talk talk Nom

254M: [huh huh huh]

255E: dakedo moo betsuni kankeinaku **ne**:. (.) sorede ] dakedo  
but Int especially don't-care ne and-then but

256M: huh huh hah hah hah hah hah hah hah hah hah]

257E: nanka nani o hanashi temo yorokobu hitotachi tte iru no **yone**.=  
something what O talk even enjoy people Top exist Nom yone

258M: = ha::::n. (.) soo na n da **ø**.  
really so Cop Nom Cop

(gloss)

1E: When Machiko was here (in E's room), =  
2M: = Uh-huh.  
3E: somebody knocked on my door **wake yo**.  
4M: UH-HUH. =  
5/6E: = Because it was midnight **ne** and because it was after one o'clock, =  
7M: = UH-HUH. =  
8-10E: = and because I was scared (.) I said 'Who are you?'  
'Who is it?' or something **no ka na**:. (see p.120 for *ka na*.)  
11E: .hh And er (.) this person said 'Me' or something **no ne**. =  
12M: = Uh-huh.  
13E: .hh And I don't know who it is, right **ø**?  
14M: (laughter)  
15/16E: And I said 'So say your name' and  
17M: Uh-huh.  
18E: .hh this person did not saying anything more **no yo**.  
19M: Uh-huh.  
20E: And because I didn't have a choice I opened the door **no ne**.  
21E: And out of the blue **ne** what do you think he said **ø**?  
22E: The person said 'you are rude' **no yo**.  
23M: (laughter)  
24E: Like 'Why?',

25M: Yeah yeah yeah.  
 26 (0.5)  
 27-32E: I told him why I am rude only because I have not returned this **ne**:  
 crummy **ne**: screwdriver and,  
 33M: Ri:ght.  
 34E: .hh I told him 'I'm scared here by myself **yo**'.  
 35M: (laughter) =  
 36E: = **Ne**. (.) It's natural to ask who it is, isn't it  $\emptyset$ ?  
 37M: Yeah.  
 38E: I said it to him, and (laughter) he was really angry  $\emptyset$ .  
 40-41M: Did he get angry  $\emptyset$ ? (.) He was saying 'Please return it  
 sooner **ne**', though sa:[IP].  
 42E: Why why,  
 43M: ( )  
 44E: does he make such a fuss about a screw driver  $\emptyset$ ?  
 45-46M: .hh we:ll he sounds quite fussy himself, though  $\emptyset$ .  
 47E: But, (1.0)  
 48/49E: is that screwdriver a life line for him  $\emptyset$ ?  
 50 (.)  
 51E: ( )  
 52-53M: (laughter) But he brought that screwdriver  
 from Korea sa:[IP]. .  
 54E: But you can buy one for a pound around here, right  $\emptyset$ ?  
 55/56M: (laughter)  
 57E: At a one-pound shop sa:[IP].=  
 58M: = You can  $\emptyset$ . ( )  
 59E: You can, right  $\emptyset$ ? =  
 60M: = ( )  
 61E: ( )  
 62M: Yea:h. (laughter)  
 63/64E: Er er: (.) then er **ne**: after that **ne** he said 'I am disappointed'  $\emptyset$ .  
 65 (0.5)  
 66M: I cannot believe it  $\emptyset$ ! =  
 67/68E: = 'What did you expect?' **yone** - if so. (laughter)  
 69-71M: But what should I say (.) well er (.) he just cannot express  
 something subtle (laughter) in English  $\emptyset$ . (laughter).  
 72-74E: (laughter) that he was disappointed means (.) he had some  
 expectation, right  $\emptyset$ ? (laughter)  
 75/76M: That's right **yone**. Yea::h 'I thought you were a better person' or  
 something like that **ne**. (laughter).  
 77/78E: If that's the case, it is like 'You had the wrong idea about  
 me' ( ) Like 'You misunderstood **yo**'  $\emptyset$ .  
 79-81M: (laughter) Right right right  $\emptyset$ . (laughter). So it probably wasn't  
 just that he couldn't express something subtle  $\emptyset$ .  
 82E: Is it so **na**::.  
 83M: .hh .hh I don't know, though  $\emptyset$ .  
 84 (1.0)  
 85?: Yeah.  
 86 (2.0)  
 87/88M: And yesterday er almost everyone was Korean well some of them were  
 English and,  
 89E: Uh-huh.  
 90M: and one person er:, =  
 91E: = Who was it who picked up the phone just before  $\emptyset$ ? The husband  $\emptyset$ ?  
 92 (0.8)

93M: Oh yeah that's the husband ø.  
 94E: Really.  
 95M: Yeah he is a very nice person yo.  
 96 (0.8)  
 97/98M: Er (1.0) Yeah. (1.0) Er cos he seems kind and gentle and,  
 99E: Yeah, that's right yone.  
 100M: Yea::h. =  
 101E: = Er I felt the same when I talked to him on the phone ø.  
 102/103M: He is, isn't he ø? Yea:h he is so yo. He seems very nice ø.  
 104E: Yeah.  
 105 (1.0)  
 106M: Because they're all Christians,  
 107E: Yea::h.  
 108M: He seems fairly gentle ne.  
 109E: Righ::t.  
 110M: A::nd,  
 111E: Uh-huh.  
 112M: he is not like a dirty old man and,  
 113E: (laughter)  
 114M: I said Machiko's father was so before, didn't I ø?  
 115/116E: Er ne er have you had some kind of bad experience with  
 a dirty old man ø? You've met lots of them ø?  
 117-120M: (laughter) No no no no no no no no er (men) are divided into two  
 types yone: typically when men reach their fifties.  
 121 (0.8)  
 122M: Whether they follow the very scruffy route or,  
 123E: (laughter)  
 124M: remain tidy ( )  
 125/126E: But a person who's going to be scruffy is scruffy even before his  
 fifties, isn't he ø?  
 127M: (laughter)  
 128E: Already in their thirties,  
 129/130M: (laughter) You are probably right ø.  
 131E: really::: you can guess yo. =  
 132/133M: = (laughter) Tha::t's (laughter) something you can guess ne::. =  
 134E: = Yea:h.  
 135M: Surely ø.  
 136 (1.0)  
 137M: Yea::h.  
 138/139E: Young people in twenties ne:: er:: there are even some young who  
 become so ne.  
 140M: That's right ne:.  
 141E: Yeah.  
 142M: Because scruffy people are scruffy from the beginning ø.  
 143 (1.0)  
 144M: I don't know though ø.  
 145 (.)  
 146-148M: And then er:: yeah (.) he is a really great person no ne. (.) .hh so  
 when he is with us it's like 'Oh you are here?'and,  
 149E: Is their son here in Durham too ø?  
 150/151M: Their daughter:: they have three daughters oh two daughters ø.  
 152E: Righ:t.  
 153-155M: They have one son, don't they ø? .hh One of the daughters has not  
 come back yet, I mean, it looks like she's not coming back this  
 year ø. She is in Austria ( )

156E: Right. All of them are students, aren't they ø?

157-160M: All three of them are still students and, the oldest is doing music at like a music school in Austria, and I've forgotten what exactly she is doing there but she is doing music, classical music, no ne.

161/162E: Really. Is she studying at a famous music school in Vienna or something like that ø?

163/164M: I don't know which school ø. (.) But I think she's at some place like that ø. I heard six years,

165E: What instrument does she play ø?

166M: Hang on I heard it's a ten-year course ø.

167E: (.)

168E: Wow:: if so,

169M: I heard it takes about ten years to graduate from that kind of school ø. =

170/171E: = Oh then did she start the course from junior high school or high school age ø?

172-175M: I think she entered the school when she was a tee:::nager ø. Yes. I think she entered the school when she was a teenager ø. And so probably after she graduated from high school, isn't it ø?.

176E: Then they are rich ne:.

177M: They are rich yo::. =

178-180E: = .hh Because some Japanese music students sometimes study abroad and (1.0) if their parents don't have money ne, they can't afford to send them yo::. =

181M: = That's right yone. It costs millions of yen, doesn't it ø? Uh-huh.

182/183E: Yea::h do you know a famous soprano singer called Yuuko Shirasagi ø?

185M: A soprano singer ø?

186/187E: The one who sometimes does things on NHK TV programs ø.

188M: I don't know her ø.

189-197E: And she also ne: graduated from college of the arts and .hh er went abroad to study yone. And My mum's in her fan club ( ) (laughter) In fact, that singer's about the same age as me, but my mum's not in my fan club ( ) Like 'Start up my fan club, if you're my mum!' ø.

198M: Right:::t. (laughter) ( )

199/200E: And er ne ( )

201/202M: What do you do to entertain fans ø?

203E: Er what should I do na::. =

204M: =(laughter) How about ( ) ø?

205E: Wait a second ne.(.) Er:: could I talk na::.

206M: (laughter) Talk (laughter) talk show ø.

207/208E: (laughter) Er: I will give a lecture or something ø.

209M: Er:: 'Tanaka Etsuko talk show' ø.

210/211E: Yeah yeah what would I talk about ø? =

212M: = (laughter) =

213-215E: = I might have some problems with it ø. (laughter) 'The catalogue of disasters during my stay in the UK ( )'.

216/217M: (laughter) 'A catalogue of disasters in the UK',

218E: 'My true experiences show' ø.

219M: 'The story of my vagabond-life in the UK and the USA' ø. (laughter)

220E: My vagabond life ø. (laughter)

221M: (laughter) 'On the way I dropped in to Japan for just a moment' ø.

222/223E: Right right right ø. (.) 'I came back to Japan on the way' ø.

224 (0.5)  
 225-227M: **Ne.** (laughter) But er but you can't finish the story in two hours  
**yone.**  
 228M: (1.5)  
 229E: if you start talking about it **ø.** =  
 230E: = Oh I wouldn't be able to finish it (**yo**).  
 231M: (laughter)  
 232-234E: (laughter) Sometimes I tell these trivial stories in class, and the  
 students enjoy them sa:[IP].  
 236M: Yeah.  
 237/238E: A:nd when I tell stories like that in class at the university, the  
 students suddenly wake up no **ne**.  
 239M: (laughter)  
 240-244E: Their sleepy faces suddenly wake up no **ne** (.) and I feel encouraged  
**ne**, and sometimes can't stop talking **ne:**. I have talked for  
 ninety minutes before **ø**.  
 245M: Really! that's chancy **ne:**.  
 246/247E: But even so (.) er **ne** it depends on the students. .hh It really  
 depends on which class I am teaching no **yo**.  
 248M: Uh-huh.  
 249/250E: And **ne** there are some students who are like 'Stop talking rubbish  
**yo!'****ø**.  
 252M: Uh-huh Ri:ght.  
 253-257E: But I talk because I want to talk without worrying about the  
 students **ne:**. (.) And but er there are some students who enjoy  
 everything I talk about no **yone**.  
 258M: Really. (.) Right **ø** .

## APPENDIX B

### Transcription of a Marked Talk-in-Interaction Type

#### Analysed in Chapter 5

P: Presenter

J: Jun

B: Unknown person in the studio

1P: moshimo.  
hello

2J: moshimoshi.  
hello

3P: takenouchi yutaka kun desu ka ø? =  
Takenouchi Yutaka Title Cop Q

4J: = hai (.) honto (.) yokogao ga niteru n desu **yo**.  
yes truth profile S similar Nom Cop yo

5P: datte ja yokogao no shashin okuttekoi **yo**  
because then profile LK photo send-Order yo

6P: shoomen no jana[kute.]  
front one Cop-Neg

7J: [ia ] okurimasu okurimasu ø. hh moo  
no send send Intensifier

8J: nama mitekudasai ø. heh heh =  
the-real-thing see-Request

9P: = nama **ne**.  
the-real-thing ne

10J: ha:i. =  
yes

11P: = u:n. nama made koreru ka **na::** [jun kun?]  
right the-real-thing until can-come Q na Jun Title

12J: [ha:i ] soo desu **ne**.  
yes so Cop ne

13J: [hah hah .hh]

14P: [u::n. ] .hh e:tto yamagata ken no,  
yeah er Yamagata prefecture LK

- 15J: hai.  
yes
- 16P: **ne.** (.) e:: genzai ni juusan sai de, =  
ne er now twenty-three years-old and
- 17J: = hai hai.  
yes yes
- 18P: e:: donna shigoto o yatteiru n desu ka ima ø? =  
er what-kind-of job O do Nom Cop Q now
- 19J: = a (.) fukushi kei na n desu **yo:** =  
oh welfare relation Cop Nom Cop yo
- 20P: = a:: [ ] kokoro no yasashi[i ] hito [da:: ø.]  
oh heart LK kind person Cop
- 21J: [hai.] [hai.] [dakara ] (.)  
yes yes therefore
- 22J: moshi kanojo dekitara:,  
if girlfriend can-have-Conditional
- 23P: u::n. =  
uh-huh
- 24J: = moo (.) shinu made kaigodekimasu ø. huh hu[h ]  
Intensifier die until can-nurse
- 25P: [ma]a sore wa  
well that Top
- 26P: hito ni yorokobareru shigoto da kara **ne.**  
people by is-appreciated job Cop because ne
- 27J: [hai. (.) hai.]  
yes yes
- 28P: [kaigo tte no wa **ne.**]  
nursing such-as thing Top ne
- 29J: kanari ø.  
very-much
- 30P: u::n. =  
right
- 31J: = hai.  
yes
- 32 (0.3)
- 33P: de sa: chotto kininatteita no ga::,  
and IP little disturbing matter S



34J: hai.  
yes

35P: anoo:: kanojo::: ni,  
well girlfriend to

36J: hai.  
yes

37P: hoka no otoko:: (1.8) to doraibushitteiru tokoro  
other LK man:: with is-driving scene

38P: o mokugekishita wake [sho ø? (kanojo ga).]  
O witnessed Nom Tag girlfriend S

39J: [hai hai. ] (.) hai. =  
yes yes yes

40P: = sore o toitsume tari shita no ø?  
that O question-closely or-anything did Nom

41J: a (.) shitenai desu zenzen ø.  
er didn't-do Cop at-all

42 (0.3)

43P: NANDE SHINAI N DA YO::: =  
why don't-do Nom Cop yo

44J: = e (.) na- nande suru n desu ka ø? (.) hah hah hah [( )]  
eh why do Nom Cop Q

45P: [datte ]  
because

46P: riyuu ga wakannai jan ø. (.) hyottoshitara nanraka  
reason S don't-know Tag possibly some-kind-of

47P no riyuu ga atta kamoshinnai n [(da yo:::)]  
LK reason S existed may Nom Cop yo

48J: [a:: ]:: demo nanka  
well but something

49J: sono toki wa:::,  
that time Top

50P: u::n.  
uh-huh

51J: .hh zenzen dame datta n desu yo::.  
at-all bad was Nom Cop yo

52 (0.8)

53P: ja: sore ja: datte (.) KOKORO NO KOORYUU GA DEKITENAI  
 then that then because heart LK communication S can't-do

54P: WAKE YO::. =  
 Nom yo

55J: = iya: tte jibun mo soo omoimashita ku- kanari ø. heh [heh ] .hh u::n.  
 well Comp self too so thought fairly yeah

56P: [EE:!]  
 yeah

57P: sore tte honto: no su- hone no tokoro de (.)  
 that QT real LK real-thought LK place at

58P: koosaiDEKITENAKATTA WAKE YO::. =  
 couldn't-associate Nom yo

59J: = u::n. (.) to omoimashita ø.  
 yeah Comp thought

60 (1.0)

61P: .hh de, (.)  
 and

62J: hai.  
 yes

63P: e:: syumi wa ø?  
 er hobby Top

64 (0.5)

65J: u::nto (.) ima kanuu ya-,  
 er now canoe

66 (.)

67P: ka[nuu ø? ]  
 canoeing

68J: [yaroo ] yaroo to omotteiru n desu yo. =  
 do-Volitional do-Volitional Comp am-thinking Nom Cop yo

69P: = o:::[:::]  
 woo:::

70J: [mada ] (.) are (.) yattenai n desu kedo,  
 yet that don't-do Nom Cop though

71P: u::n.  
 uh-huh

72J: ima tomodachi no miniitte:,  
now friend LK go-to-see-and

73P: u::n.  
uh-huh

74J: nanka kyooshitsu toka kayoo kana:: tte,  
something classroom and-so-on go-frequently I-think Comp

75P: he::[:. ]  
really

76J: [omo ]tteiru n desu ø.  
am-thinking Nom Cop

77P: chinamini tomodachi wa ooi hoo ø? (.) jun [kun.]  
by-the-way friend Top many side Jun Title

78J: [a ] ooi desu ø.  
yes many Cop

79P: a::n. =  
all-right

80J: = hai.  
yes

81P: .hh de (.) kaigo fukushi:, =  
and nursing welfare

82J: = hai. =  
yes

83P: = fukushi no, =  
welfare LK

84J: = hai.  
yes

85P: shikaku o torootoshiteiru, =  
qualification O are-trying-to-take

86J: = a (.) rainen desu ø.  
Yes next-year Cop

87P: u::n.  
right

88J: hai.  
yes

89P: .hh ojiichan to obaachan no hanashi o yoku (.) kiki  
old-men and old-women LK story O well listen

90P: soo da **ne**: jun kun [wa].  
seem Cop ne Jun Title Top

91J: [a ] kikimasu **yo**. hah hah .hh =  
oh listen yo

92P: = kikijoozu daro **o**.  
good-at-listening Tag

93J: ki- kimasu **o**. hai. (.) a kedo shaberimasu **o**.  
listen yes oh but talk

94 (1.0)

95P: demo shaberi:: wa anmari joozujanasa[soo da **ne**.]  
but talk Top very don't-seem-skilful Cop ne

96J: [a:: nanka ]  
er something

97J: shaberi- nanka tomodachi kara iwareru n desu **yo**.  
talk something friend by am-told Nom Cop yo

98P: a::n.  
uh-huh

99J: nanka (0.8) koo otonashikushitereba,  
something er keep-quiet-Conditional

100P: u:n.  
uh-huh

101J: nimaime na n da kedo: ,=  
cool Cop Nom Cop but

102P: = iya dakara nimaime jana[i **o**. ]  
no as-I-said-before cool Cop-Neg

103B: [(laughter)][(laughter)]

104J: [(laughter)][(laughter)]

105J: .hh hanashi ga sanmaime na n desu **yo**::.  
talk S comedian-like Cop Nom Cop yo

106P: dakara iya iya jya- ni[mai ]me janai kara **o**!  
as-I-said-before no no cool Cop-Neg because

107J: [hai.]  
yes

108J: hai. (laughter) hai (.) [iya (.) na ]ma miru to,  
yes yes well the-real-thing see if

109P: [huh hah hah hah]

110P: nama miru to ja: nama made koreru ka **na::** =  
the-real-thing see if then the-real-thing until can-come Q na

111J: = a:::  
well

112P: huh hah hah [hah]

113J: [mo ]o ikimasu **yo.** =  
really go yo

114PB:= (laugh[ter ])

115J: [hah hah] .hh (.) u::n. (.) haittekudasai **o.**  
er enter-Request

116 (1.0)

117P: nde a[no::]:: (.) tomodachi nanka to (.) nominii  
and er friends something with go-to-drink

118P: ttari shite sa (.) nanpa toka shinai no **o?**  
or-something do-and IP girl-hunting and-so-on don't-do Nom

119J: iya: mae:: shita n desu kedo:, =  
well before did Nom Cop but

120P: = u:n. =  
uh-huh

121J: = nanka anmari (.) sooiu: no iya na n desu **yo::**  
something very such Nom dislike Cop Nom Cop yo

122P: a::[::( )]  
all right

123J: [ko- nan-] nanka (0.8) futsuu no hito ga ii tte iu ka::,  
something normal LK person S good QT say or

124P: futsuu no [hito tte,]  
normal LK person QT

125B: [(laughter) ]

126J: [(laughter) ] futsuu tte iu ka,  
normal QT say Q

127P: [FUTUU DA **YO.** (.) BETSUNI NANPA] WA!  
normal Cop yo not-especially girl-hunting Top

128J: [( ) (.) iya ] iya sooiu imi janakute:, =  
no no such meaning Cop-Neg-and

129P: = u::n.  
uh-huh

130J: koo ojoosama mitai no ga  
how-should-I-say a-girl-from-a-good-family alike one S

131J: suki na n desu ๐.  
like Cop Nom Cop

132J: .hh huh-huh huh [huh-huh huh-huh ]

133P: [OMAE sa::,]  
you IP

134J: hai. (laughter) [(laughter)]  
yes

135P: [ja: oj- ] sono kaigoshiteiru ojiichan obaachan no::  
if-so that are-nursing old-men old-women LK

136P: ano musume toka mago [toka,]  
er daughters and-so-on grandchildren and-so-on

137J: [a a] sore mo hanashi  
oh oh that too story

138J: mo aru n desu yo:: =  
too exist Nom Cop yo

139P: = ARU N JANEE [KA YO::!]  
exist Nom Cop-Neg Q yo

140J: [da- da]kedo da[kedo,]  
but but

141P: [omae ] shikkaku da yo:  
you disqualification Cop yo

142P: o[mae] sa::! =  
you IP

143J: [.hh]

144J: = iya (.) dakedo,  
no but

145P: EE:! =  
yes

146J: = dakedo (0.5) nanka mada sooiu  
but something not-yet such

147J: omiai toka,  
a-formal-meeting-with-a-view-to-marriage and-so-on

148P: u::n.  
uh-huh

149J: nanka maa demo aratamatte tte iu,  
something well but become-formal QT say

150 (0.5)

151P: e (.) moo iya iya aratamatta hooga[ii ] tte 0.  
what Intensifier no no become-formal had-better Comp

152J: [iya] iya iya iya  
no no no no

153J: [datte,]  
because

154P: [iya ] mo- mo- moo ko- konna rajio ni ne (.) hagaki  
no Intensifier this-kind-of radio to ne postcard

155P: dashitekuru baai janai tte 0.  
send case Cop-Neg Comp

156J: iya iya mada (.) waka[i nde 0.]  
no no still young because

157P: [iya iya ] moo aratamatta hoogaii tte ( )  
no no Int become-formal had-better Comp

158J: iya iya iya [( ) (.) onegaishimasu 0.]  
no no no do-me-a-favour-Request

159BP: [(laughter) ] (laughter)

160J: onegaishimasu 0.  
do-me-a-favour-Request

161P: u::n.  
yeah

162J: ee.  
yes

163P: nanka koo kawatta mono motteru ne anata nijju ko gurai  
something er strange thing have ne you twenty piece about

164P: motteiru mono nani kore 0?  
have thing what this

165J: niyu kko 0?  
twenty piece

166P: u::n.  
yeah

167 (1.0)

168P: bonsai ø.  
bonsai

169J: a: soo desu soo desu **yo**::. moo jicchan kara moratta n desu **yo**::.  
oh so Cop so Cop yo Int old-man from received Nom Cop yo

170 (0.5)

171P: DARE DA **YO** sono jicchan?  
who Cop yo that old-man

172J: huh ha[h hah]

173P: [bon ]sai kureru jicchan ø?  
bonsai give old-man

174J: iya: nanka moo han tomodachi na n desu kedo,  
well something Intensifier half friend Cop Nom Cop and

175BP: (laughter)

176J: hh hh hh hai.  
yes

177P: .hh bonsai ii **yo ne**.  
bonsai good yo ne

178J: a ii desu **yo**::. =  
yes good Cop yo

179P: = iya ore mo ne (.) bonsai wa **ne** (.) jitsuwa (.) ussura  
well I too ne bonsai Top ne in-fact slightly

180P: kyoomi ga [at]te,  
interest S have-and

181J: [a ]  
oh

182J: agemasu ka ø?  
give Q

183P: iya iranee **yo**. =  
no don't-need yo

184J: = a (.) huh hah hah [(laughter)]  
oh

185B: [(laughter)] [(laughter)]

186P: [da ] [tte sa:,]  
because IP



187J: [hai. ] hai.  
yes yes

188P: (1.0) are sugoi aato da **yo na:**.  
that very art Cop yo na

189J: a hai. soo da to omoimasu **o**.  
oh yes so Cop Comp think

190 (0.5)

191J: hai. =  
yes

192P: = are sa: (.) asoko no nakani,  
that IP over-there LK inside

193J: ee. =  
yes

194P: = sono kisetsu (.) toka omoi o [fu ]ujikometa,  
er season and-so-on thoughts O confined

195J: [hai.]  
Yes

196J: hai.  
yes

197P: mono:: ga an da **yo [ne.]**  
thing S exist-Nom Cop yo ne

198J: [ha ][i.]  
yes

199P: [a ]no chicchana, =  
that small

200J: = hai. =  
yes

201P: = bonsai no nakani **na:**.. =  
bonsai LK inside na

202J: = hai.  
yes

203P: u:::n.  
right

204J: hai.  
yes

205P: n::de::: jibun no apiiru pointo::,  
and self LK appealing point

206J: hai.  
yes

207P: wa,  
Top

208J: hai.  
yes

209P: e::: yokogao ga takeno[uchi ni,]  
er profile S Takenouchi to

210J: [moo ] maji desu maji 0. (.) honto na  
Int serious Cop serious true Cop

211J: n de[su yo.]  
Nom Cop yo

212P: [de: ] kore wa,  
and this Top

213J: hai.  
yes

214P: uso desu 0.(.) risunaa no minasan.  
lie Cop listener LK everyone

215J: iya (.) honto desu 0. .hh hah hah  
no truth Cop

216P: ZETT[AI uso desu 0.]  
absolutely lie Cop

217J: [hontoo desu ] hontoo desu 0.  
real Cop truth Cop

218P: u::n. =  
right

219J: = tomodachi kara mo (.) koo (.) yobaseteiru n desu yo.  
friend from too er make-(someone)-call Nom Cop yo

220P: nan te 0?  
what QT

221J: takenouchi san toka,  
Takenouchi Title and-so-on

222P: omae (.) migurushii [otoko da na! ]  
you-Vulgar dishonourable man Cop na

223J: [hah hah hah hah] iya honto- hah  
no true

224J: [hah hah]

225P: [omae ] wa migurushii otoko da ø!  
you-Vulgar Top dishonourable man Cop

226J: iya honto desu ø.  
no truth Cop

227? (laughter)

228J: hai. (.) hai. =  
yes yes

229P: = dareka ni niteiru tte koto wa jibun no orijinaru de  
someone to resembling QT matter Top self LK original with

230P: shoobu[shitenai tte koto na n da yo!]  
don't-contest QT matter Cop Nom Cop yo

231J: [a soo desu ne. a ] soo desu ne. =  
yes so Cop ne yes so Cop ne

232P: = wakaruru ka ø?  
understand Q

233J: hai.  
yes

234P: na. (.) jibun no orijinaru de ii n da yo.  
na self LK original with OK Nom Cop yo

235J: ha[i.]  
yes

236P: [BA]NDOO SAN DE II NO YO.: [bandoo san de. ]  
Bandoo Title with OK Nom yo Bandoo Title with

237J: [a (.) ii n desu ka ø.] heh heh heh  
oh OK Nom Cop Q

238B: orijinaru ja:[(nee jan ø.)]  
original Cop-Neg Tag

239P: [a (.) origi ]naru [( )]  
oh original

240J: [hai. heh heh heh] hai hah hah hah  
yes yes

241P: moo ii no yo [sore] wa nitenakute.  
Intensifier OK Nom yo that Top don't-resemble

242J: [hai.]  
yes

243J: hai.  
yes

244P: u:n. .hh de ano:::::::::: suki na josei no::: taipu wa ø?  
 yeah and er favorite Cop woman LK type Top

245J: a (.) kao desu ka ø?  
 oh face Cop Q

246 (0.5)

247P: un. (.) kao ø.  
 yeah face

248J: kao wa:: koo: me: me hana kukkiri,  
 face Top er eye eye nose clear

249P: u:n.  
 uh-huh

250J: sukkiri,  
 clear

251P: u::n.  
 uh-huh

252J: sawayaka,  
 refreshing

253P: u:n.  
 uh-huh

254J: hai.  
 yes

255P: .hh nde (.) seikaku wa ø?  
 and personality Top

256J: akaruku,  
 bright-and

257P: u:n.  
 uh-huh

258J: koo himawari no yoo na hito ø.  
 er sunflower LK alike Cop person

259P: himawari no yo- massugi taiyoo nimukatte  
 sunflower LK straight sun go-towards

260P: nobitei[ku himawari no yoo na massugu na hito da na?]  
 grow sunflower LK alike Cop straight Cop person Cop na

261J: [a (.) soo desu soo desu ø. hai hai ] hai.  
 yes so Cop so Cop yes yes yes

262P: .hh nde::: nenrei wa ø?  
 and age Top

263J: nenrei wa:: jibun ga nanka (0.3) toshishita toka iya na  
age Top self S something younger and-so-on dislike Cop

264J: n desu yo.  
Nom Cop yo

265P: a [(.) to]shiue ga ii n da ø.  
oh older S good Nom Cop

266J: [demo ]  
but

267J: hai.  
yes

268P: ue (.) ue nan sai gurai made o[kke: ø?]  
older older what year-old about up-to OK

269J: [koo ] (.) koo  
er er

270J: nanka koo (.) michibiite (.) kureru hito ga ø. huh hah hah =  
something er lead give person S

271P: = u:n. =  
right

272J: = hai. (.) nijuu roku shichi ø.  
yes twenty six seven

273P: ha:[::n. ] (.) a sore zenzen ari da na. =  
all-right yes that perfectly OK Cop na

274J: [hai. ]  
yes

275J: = hai.  
yes

276P: nijuu san da kara na. =  
twenty three Cop because na

277J: = hai.  
yes

278P: e[::: ] ato (.) shinchoo nan senchi aru ø?  
er furthermore height what centimeter have

279J: [hai.]  
yes

280J: a (.) hyaku hachijuu ichi desu ø.  
yes hundred eighty one Cop

281P: a (.) dekkai jan 0.  
oh tall Tag

282J: hai.  
yes

283P: taijuu wa 0?  
weight Top

284J: nanajuu ichi (.) ni 0.  
seventy one two

285P: hara dete[(ru 0?)]  
stomach stick-out

286J: [a ] (.) chotto dake 0.  
woops little only

287P: DAME YO! (.) ANTA [NIJUU SAN] SAI DE SONNA HARA DETE CHA[:!]  
bad yo you twenty three age at such stomach stick-out if

288J: [hah hah hah] [i ]ya:  
well

289J: kookoo no toki kara detemasu 0. hah hah hah =  
high-school LK time from stick-out

290P: = dame dame sheepuappu sheepua[ppu 0]  
bad bad shape-up shape-up

291J: [hai ] hai. =  
yes yes

292P: = ee:! =  
yeah

293J: = hai.  
yes

294P: body mo daiji 0.  
body also important

295J: hai.  
yes

296P: ha:i. (.) .hh (.) iya: ano: mata: an- ano hakkirito koo: uchi  
yes well er again er clearly er this-program

297P: no: entorii:: naru ka dooka wa,  
LK entry become Q whether Top

298J: hai.  
yes

299P: otte renrakusuru n de ①.  
later will-contact Nom Cop

300J: hai.  
yes

301P: un.  
yeah

302J: ( ) zehi onegashimasu ①.  
by-all-means do-me-a-favour-Request

303P: hah ha[h hah ] moo nanka sa:,  
Intensifier something IP

304J: [hah hah]

305J: hai.  
yes

306P: sugoi hihi- (.) hisshisa ga tsutawattekuru n da kedo na[nka ①].  
very desperateness S feel Nom Cop but something

307J: [a ]  
yes

308J: (.) zehi hh hh hai ikimasu n de ①. (.) sochira ni ①.  
all-by-means yes go Nom and there to

309 (0.5)

310P: hh iya (.) konakutei[i ( n da yo.)]  
no don't-need-to-come Nom Cop yo

311J: [(laughter) ]

312B: [(laughter) ] (laughter)

313J: iki[masu yo:.]  
go yo

314P: [datte ] yamagata da kara docchikatteba yamagata no hoo de::,=  
because Yamagata Cop because if-possible Yamagata LK side Cop

315J: = hai.  
yes

316P: kanketsushite hoshii n da ① ore [wa].  
finish want Nom Cop I Top

317J: [a ] a soo desu ne.  
right right so Cop ne

318P: un. hah hah =  
Yeah

319J: = hai. (.) moo nama misemasu n de .  
yes Intensifier the-real-thing show Nom Cop

320P: iya nama mitakunai n [da yo dakara.]  
no the-real-thing don't-want-to-see Nom Cop yo as-I-said-before

321J: [iya: ] mitekudasai .  
No see-Request

322BJP: (laughter)

323P: iya nama mitakunai n [da (yo!)]  
no the-real-thing don't-want-to-see Nom Cop yo

324J: [iya: ]  
no

325J: mitekudasai .(laughter)  
see-Request

326BJP: (laughter)

327J: hai. hah hah  
yes

328 (1.0)

329P: wakatta .  
understood

330J: hai. =  
yes

331P: = ja:: ano:::(.)kaigosuru renai o hagukumitai to iu ko[to (na).]  
then er care-for love O want-to-bring-up QT say matter na

332J: [hai. ]  
yes

333J: (.) hai (.) osewashimasu .  
yes take-care-of

334P: wakarimashita . =  
understood

335J: = hai.  
yes

336P: ja renraku mattetekudasai .  
then contact wait-Request

337J: hai. (.) [( ) doomo (.) ganbarima:su . (.) hai. (.)] hai.  
yes thanks do-my-best yes yes



338P: [ha::i (.) ha:i (.) ja: ne: (.) ha::i. ]  
 yes yes then ne yes

(gloss)

1P: Hello.  
 2J: Hello.  
 3P: Is that Yutaka Takenouchi ø? =  
 4J: = Yes (.) honestly (.) I look just like him in profile yo.  
 5/6P: Well in that case send me a photo of you in profile yo,  
 not one from the front.'  
 7/8J: OK I'll I send one I'll send one ø. hh Have a look at  
 the real thing ø. (laughter) =  
 9P: = The real thing ne.  
 10J: Ye:s.  
 11P: Righ:t. I wonder if you'll be chosen for coming to the studio to show  
 us the real thing na, Jun?  
 12/13J: Ye:s you're right ne. (laughter)  
 14P: Yea::h. .hh O:kay you are from Yamagata prefecture and,  
 15J: Yes.  
 16P: Ne. (.) Er:: you're twenty three years old now and, =  
 17J: = Yes yes.  
 18P: Er:: what kind of job do you do now ø? =  
 19J: = Oh (.) my job is to do with welfare yo. =  
 20P: = O::h you are a kind person ø.  
 21/22J: Yes. Yes. So (.) if I find a girlfriend,  
 23P: Uh-huh. =  
 24J: = I'll definitely take care of her until I (or she) die ø. (laughter)  
 25/26P: Well it's a job where people appreciate you ne.  
 27J: Yes. (.) Yes.  
 28P: The caring professions, I mean ne.  
 29J: Very much ø.  
 30P: Righ::t. =  
 31J: = Yes.  
 32 (0.3)  
 33P: There's just something bothering me,  
 34J: Yes.  
 35-38P: We::ll you saw your girlfriend out for a drive with another guy,  
 didn't you ø?  
 39J: Yes yes. (.) Yes.=  
 40P: = Did you ask her about it ø?  
 41J: Er (.) I didn't at all ø.  
 42 (0.3)  
 43P: Why don't you ask her yo::? =  
 44J: = Eh wh- why would I do that ø? (laughter) ( )  
 45-47P: Because you don't know the reason why she was out with him ø.  
 There probably was some reason or other (yo::).  
 48/49J: We:::ll but at the time,  
 50P: Uh-huh.  
 51J: .hh I just couldn't do it yo::.  
 52 (0.8)  
 53/54P: Well you know what that means? It means you are not really  
 communicating with her wake yo::! =  
 55J: = I've wondered the same thing myself, quite a bit ø. (laughter) Yea::h.

56-58P: You understand, right! I mean that you weren't really with her in any real sense **yo**::! =

59J: = Yea::h. I thought I wasn't **o**.

60 (1.0)

61P: .hh And, (.)

62J: Yes.

63P: er:: what's your hobby **o**?

64 (0.5)

65-68J: Er:: (.) I am thinking of starting canoeing now **yo**. =

69P: = Woo:::.....

70J: Although I haven't tried it yet,

71P: Uh-huh.

72J: I went to see my friend doing it and,

73P: Uh-huh.

74-76J: I am thinking of taking some classes **o**.

77P: By the way are you the kind of person who has a lot of friends **o**, Jun?

78J: Yes a lot **o**.

79P: A::ll right. =

80J: = Yes.

81-85P: .hh And (.) you are trying to get qualified as a care worker, =

86J: = Yes (.) next year **o**.

87P: Righ::t.

88J: Yes.

89/90P: Apparently you're good at listening to the stories of old folks **ne**, Jun?

91J: Oh I listen **yo**. (laughter) =

92P: = You must be a good listener, mustn't you **o**?.

93J: I listen **o**, yes. (.) Oh but I talk **o**.

94 (1.0)

95P: But it seems you're not a good talker **ne**.

96/97J: With respect to talk er there's something I'm told by my friends **yo**.

98P: Uh-huh.

99J: Er (0.8) keeping my mouth shut,

100P: Uh-huh.

101J: makes me cool but, =

102P: = No I told you before you're not cool **o**.

103B: (laughter)

104J: (laughter)

105J: My talk is like a comedian's **yo**::.

106P: No no as I said you are not cool **o**!

108J: Yes. (laughter) Yes. (.) Well (.) if you see the real thing,

109P: (laughter)

110P: If I see the real thing- will you make it to the studio to show us the real thing **na**::. =

111J: = We:::ll.

112P: (laughter)

113J: I will definitely come **yo**. =

114PB: = (laughter)

115J: (laughter) .hh (.) Er:: (.) please let me come to the studio **o**.

116 (1.0)

117/118P: And er::: (.) when you go drinking with your friends, ~~don't you pick up girls **o**?~~

119J: We:ll I did before but, =

120P: = Uh-huh. =

121J: = I don't like that kind of thing very much **yo**::.

122P: A::ll r::ight. ( )  
 123J: I like, what should I say, normal girls,  
 124P: A normal girl!  
 125B: (laughter)  
 126J: (laughter) Normal or,  
 127P: Picking up a girl is normal **yo**!  
 128J: ( ) (.) No no, that's not what I mean, =  
 129P: = Uh-huh.  
 130-132J: er I fancy kind of innocent girls **ø**. (laughter)  
 133P: You!  
 134J: Yes. (laughter)  
 135/136P: So the daughters and grandchildren of the old men and women you're talking care of,  
 137/138J: Oh oh I do get offers like that **yo**::. =  
 139P: = So you do have offers then **yo**::!  
 140J: Bu- but but,  
 141/142P: You are disqualified **yo**::, you! =  
 144J: = No (.) but,  
 145P: Do you understand? =  
 146/147J: = But (0.5) I'm not ready for anything like an arranged date,  
 148P: Uh-huh.  
 149J: Like some kind of formal thing,  
 150 (0.5)  
 151P: What? You'd better be ready for something formal **ø**.  
 152/153J: No no no no because,  
 154/155P: No in your case it's no good just sending a postcard to this kind of radio program **ø**.  
 156J: No no, I am still young **ø**.  
 157P: No no, you need to be more formal **ø**.  
 158J: No no no ( ) (.) Please **ø**.  
 159BP: (laughter)  
 160J: Please **ø**.  
 161P: Yea::h.  
 162J: Yes.  
 163/164P: And you own something unusual **ne**. About twenty of them, what are they **ø**?  
 165J: Twenty **ø**?  
 166P: Yea::h.  
 167 (1.0)  
 168P: Bonsai **ø**.  
 169J: Oh: that's right that's right **yo**::. The old man gave them to me **yo**::.  
 170 (0.5)  
 171P: Who is that old man **yo**?  
 172J: (laughter)  
 173P: The old man who gives you bonsai **ø**?  
 174J: We:ll er we are like half friends,  
 175BP: (laughter)  
 176J: (laughter) Yes.  
 177P: .hh Bonsai are cool **yo ne**.  
 178J: Yes they are cool **yo**::=  
 179/180P: = Actually I'm a bit interested in bonsai too and,  
 181/182J: Oh shall I give you some **ø**?  
 183P: No I don't want any **yo**::=  
 184J: = Oh. (.) (laughter)  
 185B: (laughter)

186P: Because,  
 187J: Yes yes.  
 188P: (1.0) bonsai are great art **yo na**:.  
 189J: Oh yes. I think so **o**.  
 190 (0.5)  
 191J: Yes. =  
 192-197P: = You get things like the seasons, ideas and what have you  
 incorporated into them **yo ne**.  
 198J: Yes.  
 199-201P: Into those tiny bonsai **na**:. =  
 202J: = Yes.  
 203P: Righ::t.  
 204J: Yes.  
 205-207P: A::nd your most appealing point is,  
 208P: Yes.  
 209P: Er::: your profile's like Takenouchi's,  
 210/211J: I'm serious I'm serious **o**. (.) It's true **yo**.  
 212P: And this is,  
 213J: Yes.  
 214P: a lie **o**. (.) Just to let our listeners know.  
 215J: No (.) it's true **o**. (laughter)  
 216P: It's absolutely a lie **o**.  
 217J: It's true it's true **o**.  
 218P: Righ::t. =  
 219J: = My friends- I get them to call me this **yo**.  
 220P: What **o**?  
 221J: Takenouchi,  
 222P: You're a dreadful man **na**!  
 223/224J: (laughter) No it's true- (laughter)  
 225P: You're a dishonorable man **o**!  
 226J: No it's true **o**.  
 227?: (laughter)  
 228J: Yes. (.) Yes. =  
 229/230P: = Looking like someone means you are using your own originality to  
 play the game **yo**!  
 231J: Yes you're right **ne**. Yes you're right **ne**. =  
 232P: = Do you understand **o**?  
 233J: Yes.  
 234P: **Na** [translated as 'Right?']. (.) Your own originality is okay **yo**.  
 235J: Yes.  
 236P: Bando is okay **yo**:: Bando.  
 237J: Oh (.) is Bando okay **o**? (laughter)  
 238B: It's not original, is it **o** ?.  
 239P: Oh (.) original ( ).  
 240J: Yes. (laughter) Yes. (laughter).  
 241P: You don't have to look like someone **yo**.  
 243J: Yes.  
 244P: Yea:h .hh And er:::::::::: what kind of a woman do you fancy **o**?  
 245J: Oh (.) you mean what does she look like **o**?  
 246: (0.5)  
 247P: Yean (.) her face **o**.  
 248J: Well she'd have clearly defined eyes and a clearly defined nose,  
 249P: Uh-huh.  
 250J: clear,  
 251P: Uh-huh.

252J: refreshing,  
 253P: Uh-huh.  
 254J: Yes.  
 255P: .hh And (.) how about personality ø?  
 256J: Cheerful,  
 257P: Uh-huh.  
 258J: someone like sunflower ø.  
 259/260P: You mean a person who grows straight towards the sun like a sunflower na?  
 261J: Yes (.) that's right that's right ø. Yes yes yes.  
 262P: .hh A:::nd what about her age ø?  
 263/264J: I don't like the woman to be younger than me yo.  
 265P: Oh (.) you prefer an older woman ø.  
 267J: Yes.  
 268P: How old is okay ø?  
 269/270J: Er (.) er er er (.) I like a woman who leads me ø. (laughter) =  
 271P: = Right: t. =  
 272J: = Yes (.) twenty six or seven ø.  
 273P: Right:::t. (.) that's no problem na. =  
 275J: = Yes.  
 276P: Because you're twenty three na. =  
 277J: = Yes.  
 278P: Er::: and (.) how tall are you ø?  
 280J: Oh (.) I'm 81cm ø.  
 281P: Oh (.) You're tall ø.  
 282J: Yes.  
 283P: How much do you weigh ø?  
 284J: Seventy one (.) two kilos ø.  
 285P: Do you have a pot belly ø?  
 286J: Woops little bit ø.  
 287P: That's no good yo! (.) A 23-year-old man shouldn't have a pot belly!  
 288/289J: (laughter) We:ll I've had it since I was a high school student ø.  
 (laughter) =  
 290P: = No no shape up shape up ø.  
 291J: Yes yes. =  
 292P: = Right!  
 293J: Yes.  
 294P: Your body is important too ø.  
 295J: Yes.  
 296-299P: Right: t. (.) .hh (.) we:ll er: I will er: let you know if you are chosen for the next step later ø.  
 300J: Yes.  
 301P: Yeah.  
 302J: ( ) Please choose me ø.  
 303-306P: (laughter) er I can feel how desperate you are ø.  
 308J: (.) I will definitely come to the studio ø.  
 309 (0.5)  
 310P: No (.) it would be better not to come (yo).  
 311J: (laughter)  
 312B: (laughter)  
 313J: I am coming yo:.  
 314-316P: If possible I want you to find a girlfriend in Yamagata prefecture ø.  
 317J: Yes yes you're right ne.  
 318P: Yeah. (laughter) =  
 319J: = Yes. (.) I will show you the real thing ø.

320P: No as I said I don't want to see it **yo**.  
 321J: No: please have a look **ø**.  
 322BJP: (laughter)  
 323P: No I don't want to see it (**yo**)!  
 325J: No: please see me **ø**. (laughter)  
 326BJP: (laughter)  
 327J: Yes. (laughter)  
 328 (1.0)  
 329P: All right **ø**.  
 330J: Yes. =  
 331P: = So:: er::: (.) you want caring love (**na**).  
 332/333J: Yes I will take care of her **ø**.  
 334P: Right **ø**. =  
 335J: = Yes.  
 336P: So please wait for us to call you **ø**.  
 337J: Yes (.) ( ) (.) I'll do my best **ø**. (.) Yes. (.) Yes.  
 338P: Ye::s. Ye::s. (.) See you **ne**::. Ye::s.

## APPENDIX C

### Transcription of Native/Non-Native Talk-in-Interaction

#### Analysed in Chapter 6

M: British Male

W: Japanese Female

1M: natto wa (.) hontoni,  
nattoo Top really

2W: tabenai yo..  
don't-eat yo

3M: suteyoo ka ø.  
dump-Volitional Q

4W: huh huh huh (.) u- doozo sutete ø.  
please dump-Request

5M: dakara mottainai jan ø .  
As-I-said-before, wasteful Tag

6 (3.0)

7W: ja tabereba ii jan ø. [( )]  
if-so eat-Conditional good Tag

8M: [na- nanka] (.) nanka bimyooni,  
something something subtly

9W: zettai tabenai yo. datte mecha hen na nioi shiteru mon ø. =  
definitely don't-eat yo because very strange Cop smell come-out because

10M: = huh huh huh huh huh huh soo da yo[:na::.. huh (.) huh ]  
so Cop yo na

11W: [huh huh huh huh huh] huh

12W: okashii mon ø kono nioi ga:. =  
strange because this smell S

13M: = soo deshoo: ø.  
so Tag

- 14W: un.  
yes
- 15 (1.5)
- 16M: mottainya:i ø.  
wasteful
- 17: (1.0)
- 18M: sugu soko ni rooson ga areba ne (.) betsun i atarashii  
just there at Lawson S exist-Conditional ne easily new
- 19M: no kaeru shi ø.  
one can-buy because
- 20W: nande rooson sonnani suki na no ø?  
why Lawson to-that-extent like Cop Nom
- 21M: rooson ga::,  
Lawson S
- 22W: sendai ookatta no ø?  
Sendai were-many Nom
- 23M: sungoi ooi (no) ø.  
very many Nom
- 24 (.)
- 25M: ho[ntoni ø.]  
honestly
- 26W: [fu:: ]:n. ko- chihoo ga ooi no- nanka saikin saikin  
right local S many Nom something recently recently
- 27W: dekihajimeta kedo ne:..  
started-to-build and ne
- 28M: nani ga ø?  
what S
- 29W: rooson ø.  
Lawson
- 30 (1.5)
- 31W: eki mae ni niken aru ø. dakedo,  
station front at two-shops exist but
- 32M: un.  
uh-huh
- 33W: sore made wa famirima no hoo ga ookatta kara ne,  
then until Top Family-Mart LK direction S were-many because ne



34 (.)

35W: famirima sangen to (.) de sebunirebun ga ( ) ni  
Family-Mart three-shops and and Seven-Eleven S at

36W: ikken atte:: (1.5) de:: rooson ga [( )] ni niken atte::,  
one-shop exist-and and Lawson S at two-shops exist-and

37M: [(cough)]

38M: un. (cough)  
uh-huh

39W: de (.) yatto eki mae ni rooson ga dekita kedo (.)  
and finally station front at Lawson S was-built but

40W: zenzen sore made (.) minna shitteru shi: (.) betsuni  
not-at-all then until everyone know and particularly

41W: zenzen nai wake janai n da kedo sugoi sukunakatta  
(not)-at-all don't-exist Nom Cop-Neg Nom Cop but very were-few

42W: uchi no mawari wa rooson ga ø.  
my-place LK around Top Lawson S

43 (1.5)

44M: u:::n. =  
yes

45W: = (na-) nanka nakanaka (the man's name) ga rooson rooson itteru to  
something quite S Lawson Lawson say when

46W: omoshiroi na: to omo[tte ø.]  
interesting na Comp think

47M: [(iya) ]:: rooson wa (1.2) boku o su-  
well Lawson Top I O

48M: nankaika sukuttekureta kara ø.  
some-times saved because

49W: un hah hah hah nankaika sukuttekureta no ø?  
right sometimes saved Nom

50M: un.  
yes

51W: inochi o ø?  
life O

52M: n?

53W: inochi o ø?  
life O

54M: inochi tuuyorimo hora (1.0) hima na toki toka ø.  
 life rather-than er free-time Cop when and-son-on

55W: a:::: hah hah hima (.) soo da ne:: =  
 free-time so Cop ne

56M: = de nanka (.) sugoi kuseninatta no wa (1.0)  
 and something very became-a-habit Nom Top

57M: yoru no juuji gurai ni::,  
 night LK ten-o'clock around at

58W: un.  
 uh-huh

59M: (1.8) nanka koo bukatsu kara kaettekite,  
 something er school-club from returned-and

60W: un.  
 uh-huh

61M: (0.5) a:: sorede: (.) nanka shukudai toka yatte, =  
 and something homework and-so-on did-and

62W: = un. =  
 uh-huh

63M: = demo juuji goro ni,  
 but ten-o'clock around at

64W: un.  
 uh-huh

65M: (.) pekepekoninan no ne.  
 become-hungry Nom ne

66W: naru ne.  
 become ne

67M: dakara sugo[i,]  
 thus very

68W: [a ] naranai yo. gomen ø. huh huh huh [huh huh ]  
 don't-become yo sorry

69M: [nannai no ø?]  
 don't-become Nom

70M: ore wa nan no ne.  
 I Top become Nom ne

71W: u::n::  
 uh-huh

72M: = de (2.8) rooson chikai kara,  
and Lawson near because

73W: un.  
uh-huh

74M: de sebunirebun mo chikai no **ne**. =  
and Seven-Eleven also near Nom ne

75W: = u[n.]  
uh-huh

76M: [de]mo (.) rooson no hoo ga nanka koo::, =  
but Lawson LK side S something er

77W: = u::n. a demo wakaruru ka[mo ø.]  
yes but know may

78M: [a ]tatakai ø. =  
warm

79W: = nanka sa: sebunirebun tte oden no nioi ga kusakunai ø?  
something IP Seven-Eleven Top oden LK smell S don't-stink

80W: fuyu ni naru to. =  
winter to become when

81M: = iya: rooson mo oden, (.)  
no Lawson also oden

82W: u::n. a soo ø. nanka anmari konbini iku hito janai  
right so something not-much convenience-store go person Cop-Neg

83W: kara ø.  
because

84M: ore: su- daisuki da konbini ø. =  
I like-very-much Cop convenience-store

85W: = nanka konbini (.) ni shocchuu iku hito i- kekkoo ooi jan ø?  
something convenience-store to often go person quite many Tag

86M: huh huh huh

87W: **ne**?  
ne

88M: soo na no ø?  
so Cop Nom

89W: un. i- izonshoo mitai ni natteiru hito ø.  
yes dependent-symptom alike to become person

90M: a::::.

- 91W: iya konbini tte betsuni sa:: sugoi yasui wake demo nai  
no convenience-store Top particularly IP very cheap Nom even Neg
- 92W: shi: nanka onaji okashi o konbini de kau no to  
and something same snack O convenience-store at buy Nom and
- 93W: itooyookadoo de kau no to dattara sa: akirakani itooyookadoo  
Itooyookadoo at buy Nom and Cop-Conditional IP clearly Itooyookadoo
- 94W: no hoo ga yasui ja:n[:: 0.]  
Nom side S cheap Tag
- 95M: [u::n.] soryaa soo [da ] 0.  
yes that-Top so Cop
- 96W: [(de)] sukunai okozukai de  
and little money with
- 97W: doredake ooku kaoo ka to omottara sa:: itooyookadoo  
how-much many buy-Volitional Q Comp think-Conditional IP Itooyookadoo
- 98W: ni ashi ga muteshimau n da yo. dakara konbini ikanakatta 0.  
to foot S direct Nom Cop yo therefore convenience-store didn't-go
- 99 (.)
- 100W: ( [ ] ) ni atta [shi 0.]  
at existed because
- 101M: [un. ] [de ]mo itooyookadoo tooi jan 0.  
uh-huh but Itooyookadoo far Tag
- 102W: huh huh uchi wa chikai no[::: 0. hah hah hah ]  
my-place Top near Nom
- 103M: [a::::: sore] wa sore wa  
that Top that Top
- 104M: ichiban da ne.  
best Cop ne
- 105W: SOO 0. =  
so
- 106M: = sore ga ichiban risoo da ne.  
that S best ideal Cop ne
- 107W: SOO 0.  
so
- 108 (1.0)
- 109M: dakara ore (.) ano oka no ue ni sundeita kara,  
therefore I er hill LK top at lived because

110W: u[n. ]  
uh-huh

111M: [do-] dokka e iku nimo,  
somewhere to go in-order-to

112W: un.  
uh-huh

113M: ikoo nimo (.) ano:: (0.8) ko- o- oka orinakyaikenai no 0.  
go-Volitional in-order-to er hill need-to-go-down Nom

114M: oriru no wa sore wa sore de ii n dakedo kaettekuru toki  
go-down Nom Top that Top that with good Nom but return when

115M: taihen [( )]  
hard-work

116W: [taihe]n da ne.  
hard-work Cop ne

117M: un.  
yes

118 (2.0)

119M: chari (0.8) chari (.) mamachari tsukatta kedo,  
bicycle bicycle bicycle used and

120W: u::n.  
uh-huh

121M: demo sore mo taihen (.) da 0.  
but that also hard-work Cop

122 (.)

123M: ( ) =

124W: = demo watashi mo eki made mainichi juugo fun aruiteta yo.  
but I also station to everyday fifteen minute walked yo

125: (0.5)

126M: n?

127W: eki made mainichi aruki datta yo.  
station to every day walking was yo

128 (1.0)

129M: ore jitensha (0.5) pakureraretara,  
I bicycle is-stolen-Conditional

130W: un.  
uh-huh

131 (0.5)

132W: [paku]rerare[tara ø?]  
is-stolen-Conditional

133M: [( )] [un. ] eki [made, ]  
yes station to

134W: [huh huh]

135 (0.8)

136M: eki made nijuppu- niyu- nijuppun gurai,  
station until twenty-minutes around

137W: u:n.  
uh-huh

138M: aruki ø.  
walking

139W: shiia made sanjuppun na n da yo aruku to.  
Shiia to thirty-minutes Cop Nom Cop yo walk if

140M: honto ø.  
true

141W: tooku nai ø?  
far Neg

142M: tooi ø. =  
far

143W: = tamani arukitai hi mo aru kedo sa.  
sometimes want-to-walk day also exist although IP

144M: demo ore (1.3) bukatsu owatte kara (.)  
but I school-club finish after

145M: aruite kaeritakunai (na::.)  
on-foot don't-want-to-return na

146W: huh huh huh waku ø sono [kimochi.]  
understand that feeling

147M: [demo ] basu wa ichijikan ni (.)  
but bus Top one-hour at

148M: ikkai (dakara) ø.  
one-time because

149 (.)

- 150M: moo                   hontoni inaka dakara 0.  
Intensifier truly    rural because
- 151W: inaka da na:..  
rural Cop na
- 152M: daka- dakara       aruku   shi[kanai 0. ]  
          therefore walking only-choice
- 153W:                                   [e     den]sha mo   hyottoshite ichijikan  
                                     er     train   also possibly   one-hour
- 154W: ni nihon         toka 0?  
          at two-train and-so-on
- 155M: uuu:n. =  
          no
- 156W: = soko[ma ]de       wa   nai 0? =  
          to-that-extent Top Neg
- 157M:           [so-]
- 158M: = chikatetsu, =  
          underground
- 159W: = a hattatsushiteiru n   da 0.  
          is-developed       Nom Cop
- 160M: so chika- tu:- chikatetsu wa chanto hashitten kedo, =  
          so                   underground Top properly run        although
- 161W: = soo ka soo ka 0. =  
          so Q so Q
- 162M: = un demo, (sniffling) =  
          yes but
- 163W: = nanka         yamagata no tomodachi ga ne:.,  
          something Yamagata LK friend   S ne
- 164M: u[n.]  
          uh-huh
- 165W: [na]nka       tookyoo no ko         tte: (.) gakkoo ni: ichijikan toka  
          something Tokyo   LK students Top        school for one-hour and-so-on
- 166W: kake temo kayoo   no ne:..  
          spend even commute Nom ne
- 167M: un. =  
          uh-huh
- 168W: = demo chihoo no ko         tte sore ga nai n   da tte:., =  
          but local LK student Top that S Neg Nom Cop QT

169M: = un nai nai 0.  
yes Neg Neg

170W: ichijikan kakeru gurai nara geshukusuru n da tte::, =  
one-hour spend about if live-alone Nom Cop QT

171M: = un.  
uh-huh

172 (.)

173W: de nande tte kiitara ne: densha wa ichijikan ni ippon toka  
and why QT when-asked ne train Top one-hour at one-train and-so-on

174W: shikanai kara ne::,  
only because ne

175M: un.  
uh-huh

176W: sono ippon o tobashitara taihen na koto ni naru  
that one-train O miss-Conditional terrible Cop matter to become

177W: kara [tte,]  
because QT

178M: [un. ] sorya-  
yes

179M: soryaa (.) densha no koto da 0.  
that-Top train LK matter Cop

180W: u:[n.]  
yes

181M: [chi]katetsu to mata chotto chigau n da 0.  
underground from also little different Nom Cop

182W: soo ka: 0.  
so Q

183 (0.3)

184W: dakara: nanka: imeejitekini: (1.5) ichijikan ni ippon tte  
therefore something impressionally one-hour at one-train QT

185W: imeeji ga aru: 0. =  
image S exist

186M: = densha wa soo da yo. =  
train Top so Cop yo

187W: = u::n.  
yes



188M: ore to dan- dan ku- ano:: ki- kinoo      atta dan kun ø.  
       I      and      Dan      er      yesterday met      Dan Title

189W: u::n.  
       yes

(gloss)

1M:            This natto (.) really,  
 2W:            I won't eat it yo:.  
 3M:            Shall we throw it away ø?  
 4W:            (laughter) (.) Go on throw it away ø.  
 5M:            As I said before dumping the natto is wasteful, isn't it ø?  
 6              (3.0)  
 7W:            If you say so you eat it ø.  
 8M:            Er (.) er subtly,  
 9W:            I won't definitely eat it yo. Because it stinks ø. =  
 10M:            = (laughter) That's right yo:na:: (laughter)  
 11/12W:        (laughter) Because this smells odd ø. =  
 13M:            = It's so, isn't it ø?  
 14W:            Yeah.  
 15              (1.5)  
 16M:            It's a waste ø.  
 17              (1.0)  
 18/19M:        If there were a Lawson (near here) ne (.) we could buy new one ø.  
 20W:            Why do you like Lawsons so much ø?  
 21M:            Lawsons,  
 22W:            Were there many Lawsons in Sendai ø?  
 21-23M:        There are many Lawsons (in Sendai) ø.  
 24              (.)  
 25M:            Honestly ø.  
 26/27W:        Ri:::ght. Many (Lawsons) are in local areas- er they have started  
                  being built (in my hometown) and ne:,  
 28M:            What have started being built ø?  
 29W:            Lawsons ø.  
 30              (1.5)  
 31W:            There are two in front of the train station ø. But,  
 32M:            Uh-huh.  
 33W:            because we had more Family-Marts (than Lawsons) until then ne,  
 34              (.)  
 35/36W:        three Family-Marts(.)and one Seven-Eleven at (      ) (1.5) and two  
                  Lawsons at (      ),  
 37M:            (cough)  
 38M:            Uh-huh. (cough)  
 39-42W:        and (.) finally a Lawson was built in front of the train station (.)  
                  but there were no Lawson until then everyone knows (about Lawsons)  
                  and it is not the case that there were no Lawson but very few around my  
                  house ø.  
 43              (1.5)  
 44M:            Righ:::t. =  
 45/46W:        = er I thought it's quite interesting that you talked about Lawsons ø.  
 47/48M:        We::ll because a Lawson saved me some times ø.  
 49W:            Right. (laughter) Did a Lawson save you sometimes ø?  
 50M:            Yeah.

51W: Saved your life ø?  
 52M: n?  
 53W: Saved your life ø?  
 54M: Not my life but rather er (1.0) when I had time ø.  
 55W: Righ:::t. (laughter) When you had time ø. (.) That's right ne::.=  
 56/57M: = And er (.) what has become rather a habit is (1.0) at 10 o'clock  
 at night,  
 58W: Uh-huh.  
 59M: (1.8) Er coming back from the school club and,  
 60W: Uh-huh.  
 61M: (0.5) er:: a:nd (.) er finishing homework and, =  
 62W: = Uh-huh. =  
 63M: = at around ten o'clock,  
 64W: Uh-huh.  
 65M: (.) I get hungry no ne.  
 66W: We do ne.  
 67M: So very,  
 68W: Oh I don't yo. Sorry ø. (laughter)  
 69/70M: Don't you ø? I do no ne.  
 71W: Uh-huh. =  
 72M: = and (2.8) because a Lawson is near (my house),  
 73W: Uh-huh.  
 74M: and a Seven-Eleven is also near no ne. =  
 75W: = Uh-huh.  
 76M: But (.) the Lawson is more er::, =  
 77W: = Righ::t. But I probably know what you mean ø.  
 78M: friendly ø. =  
 79/80W: = Er: don't Seven-Elevens' oden stink ø? =  
 81M: = No: Lawsons also, (.)  
 82/83W: O::kay. Righ::t ø. Er because I don't go to convenience stores very  
 often ø.  
 84M: I like them very much ø. =  
 85W: = Er some people often go to convenience stores, don't they ø?  
 86M: (laughter)  
 87W: Ne?  
 88M: Is it so ø?  
 89W: Yes. People who depend on them ø.  
 90M: Righ::t.  
 91-94W: Convenience stores are not especially cheap and it's clear that you  
 can buy the same snack more cheaply at Itooyookadoo than convenience  
 stores, isn't it ø?  
 95M: Yea::h. That's right ø.  
 96-98W: And considering how much snacks I can buy with a little amount of  
 money makes me to choose Itooyookadoo yo. So I didn't go to convenience  
 stores ø.  
 99 (.)  
 100W: Because there was Itooyookadoo in (somewhere ø).  
 101M: Uh-huh. But an Itooyookadoo is far, isn't it ø?  
 102W: (laughter) My house is close to Itooyookadoo ø. (laughter)  
 103/104M: A:::: that's that's best then ne.  
 105W: That's right ø. =  
 106M: = That's ideal ne.  
 107W: That's right ø.  
 108 (1.0)  
 109M: Because I lived on the top of a hill,

110W: Uh-huh.  
 111M: going anywhere,  
 112W: Uh-huh.  
 113-115M: going anywhere (.) er:: (0.8) I have to go down the hill ø.  
 To go down is not a problem but to return is a hard-work ( )  
 116W: It's a hard-work ne.  
 117M: Yes.  
 118 (2.0)  
 119M: Bicycle (0.8) bicycle (.) I used a bicycle and,  
 120W: Uh-huh.  
 121M: it is hard-work ø.  
 122 (.)  
 123M: ( ) =  
 124W: = But I also walked for fifteen minutes to the train station  
 every day yo.  
 125 (0.5)  
 126M: n?  
 127W: I walked to the station every day yo.  
 128 (1.0)  
 129M: If I have my bicycle stolen,  
 130W: Uh-huh.  
 131 (0.5)  
 132W: Stolen ø?  
 133M: Yes.  
 134W: (laughter)  
 135 (0.8)  
 136-138M: I had to walk for about twenty minutes to the station ø  
 139W: It takes thirty minutes to Shiiya yo - if I walk.  
 140M: Really ø.  
 141W: It's far, no ø?  
 142M: It's far ø. =  
 143W: = Sometimes I feel like walking though sa[IP].  
 144/145M: But I (1.3) after finishing the school-club I don't want to walk (na::).  
 146W: (laughter) I understand that feeling ø.  
 147/148M: But because there is one bus an hour ø.  
 149 (.)  
 150M: Because (the place I lived in is) very rural ø.  
 151W: Rural na::.  
 152M: So I can't help walking ø.  
 153/154W: Are there only two trains each hour or something like that ø?  
 155M: No. =  
 156W: = Not that bad ø? =  
 157/158M: = Underground, =  
 159W: = Oh (the place you lived) is developed ø.  
 160M: Although the underground runs properly, =  
 161W: = Okay okay ø. =  
 162M: yeah but, (sniffing) =  
 163W: = Er one of my friends who is from Yamagata ne::,  
 164M: Uh-huh.  
 165/166W: er students in Tokyo usually spend one hour on going to university  
 no ne::.  
 167M: Uh-huh. =  
 168W: = but she said that students in local areas do not and, =  
 169M: = Yeah, they don't ø.  
 170W: she also said that students in local areas choose to rent a room

rather than spending an hour commuting, =  
 171M: = Uh-huh.  
 172 (.)  
 173/174W: and I asked her why **ne**: she said that there is only one train an hour  
**ne::** (in local areas),  
 175M: Uh-huh.  
 176/177W: if you miss that train you will be in trouble and,  
 178/179M: Yeah. That's about railway **ø**.  
 180W: Righ::t.  
 181M: Trains are a bit different from the underground **ø**.  
 182W: Ri:ght **ø**.  
 183 (0.3)  
 184/185W: So: er:: I have an impression that there is only one train an hour  
 (in local areas) **ø**. =  
 186M: = That's a train, right, **yo**. =  
 187W: = Yea::h.  
 188M: I and Dan er: Dan you met yesterday **ø**.  
 189W: Ye::s.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Austin, J. L. (1962) *How to Do Things with Words*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Bell, J. (1999) *Doing Your Research Project: A Guide for First-time Researchers in Education and Social Science*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Bilmes, J. (1996) Problems and resources in analyzing Northern Thai conversation for English language readers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26(2): 171-188.
- Blakemore, D. (1987) *Semantic Constraints on Relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Blakemore, D. (1992) *Understanding Utterances*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Blaxter, L., Hughes, C. and Tight, M. (2001) *How to Research*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (1991) How much culture is there in intercultural communication? In J. Blommaert and J. Verschueren (eds) *The Pragmatics of International and Intercultural Communication*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp.13-31.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1997) *Dinner Talk: Cultural Patterns of Sociability and Socialization in Family Discourse*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc Inc.
- Blum-Kulka, S., Blondheim, M. and Hachohen, G. (2002) Traditions of dispute: From negotiations of Talmudic texts to the arena of political discourse in the media. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34(10-11): 1569-1594.

- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J. and Kasper, G (1989) Investigating cross-cultural pragmatics: An introductory overview. In S. Blum-Kulka and J. House, and G. Kasper (eds) *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex. pp.1-34.
- Blutner, R. (2004) Pragmatics and the lexicon. In L. R. Horn and G. Ward (eds) *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. pp.488-514.
- Blutner, R. and Zeevat, H. (eds) (2004) *Optimality Theory and Pragmatics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. (1987) *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bryman, A. (2001) *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chafe, W. (1994) *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time: The Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speaking and Writing*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Cheng, C. (1987) Shujoshi: Hanashite to kikite no ninshiki no gappu o umeru tame no bunsetsu-zi. *Nihongogaku* 6(10): 93-109.
- Clyne, M. (1994) *Inter-Cultural Communication at Work: Cultural Values in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, E. and Cooper, R. L. (1986) Language and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 13(4): 533-563.

- Cook, H. M. (1990) An indexical account of the Japanese sentence-final particle *no*. *Discourse Processes* 13(4): 401-440.
- Cook, H. M. (1992) Meanings of non-referential indexes: A case study of Japanese sentence-final particles *ne*. *Text* 12(4): 507-539.
- Cook, H. M. (1997) The role of the Japanese *masu* form in caregiver-child conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28(6): 695-718.
- Denscombe, M. (1998) *The Good Research Guide: For Small-scale Social Research Projects*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Dey, I. (1993) *Qualitative Data Analysis: A User-friendly Guide for Social Scientists*. London: Routledge.
- Eda, S. (2001) A new approach to the analysis of the sentence final particles *ne* and *yo*: An interface between prosody and pragmatics. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 9: 29-44.
- Fasulo, A. and Zucchermaglio, C. (2002) My selves and I: Identity markers in work meeting talk. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34(9): 1119-1144.
- Fauconnier, G. (1997) *Mappings in Thought and Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferguson, C. A. (1971) *Language Structure and Language Use*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Flick, U. (1998) *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967) *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.:  
Prentice-Hall.
- Garfinkel, H. (1972) Remarks on ethnomethodology. In J. J. Gumperz and D. H. Hymes  
(eds) *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*.  
New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. pp.301-324.
- Gass, S. M. and Selinker, L. (1983) *Language Transfer in Language Learning*. Rowley,  
Mass.: Newbury House Publishers.
- Goddard, C. (1998) *Semantic Analysis: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford  
University Press.
- Goffman, I. (1959) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.
- Goffman, I. (1981) *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Golato, A. (2002) German compliment responses. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34(5): 547-571.
- Greatbatch, D. (1998) Conversation analysis: Neutralism in British news interviews. In A.  
Bell and P. Garrett (eds) *Media Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell. pp.163-185.
- Grice, H. P. (1975) Logic and conversation. In P. Cole and J.L. Morgan (eds) *Syntax and  
Semantics* vol.3. New York: Academic Press. pp.41-58.
- Grice, H. P. (1978) Further notes on logic and conversation. In P. Cole (ed.) *Syntax and  
Semantics* vol.9. New York: Academic Press. pp.113-27.



- Grundy, P. (2000) *Doing Pragmatics* (2nd edn.). London: Arnold.
- Grundy, P. (2002) Profiling in talk. In J. A. Batenman and W. Wildgen (eds) *Sprachbewusstheit im Schulischen und Sozialen Kontext*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. pp.151-170.
- Grundy, P. and Jiang, Y. (2001) Ideological ground and relevant interpretation in a cognitive semantics. In R. Dirven, B. Hawkins and E. Sandikcioglu (eds) *Language and Ideology* vol.1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp.107-140.
- Gumperz, J. J (1982) *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hanks, W. F. and Duranti, A. (1992) The indexical ground of deictic reference. In A. Duranti (ed.) *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp.43-76.
- Harada, S. I. (1976) Honorifics. In M. Shibatani (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics* vol.5. New York: Academic Press. pp.499-561.
- Hayashi, R. (1991) Floor structure of English and Japanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 16(1): 1-30.
- Honda, A. (2002) Conflict management in Japanese public affairs talk shows. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34(5): 573-608.
- Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt, R. (1998) *Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices, and Applications*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Ide, R. (1998) 'Sorry for your kindness': Japanese interactional ritual in public discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 29(5): 509-530.
- Ikeda, H. (1995) Shujoshi to teineisa. *Gekkan Gengo* 24(11): 102-103.
- Izuhara, H. (1992) 'Ne' no komyunikeshon kino. In M. Fujiwara, H. Kakkenbusshu, T. Kashima, Y. Momiyama, and A. Ozaki (eds) *Nihongo Kenkyu to Nihongo Kyoiku*. Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppankai. pp. 159-172.
- Kamio, A. (1990) *Joho no Nawabari Riron: Gengo no Kinoteki Bunseki*. Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten.
- Kamio, A. (1994) The theory of territory of information: The case of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 21(1): 67-100.
- Kangasharju, H. (2002) Alignment in disagreement: Forming oppositional alliances in committee meetings. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34(10-11): 1447-1471.
- Kasper, G. and Blum-Kulka, S. (1993) *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Katagiri, Y. (1995) Shujoshi ni yoru taiwa chosei. *Gekkan Gengo* 24(11): 38-45.
- Kato, S. (2001) Bunmatsu joshi 'ne' 'yo' no danwa kosei kino. *Toyama Daigaku Jinbun Gakubu Kiyo* 35: 31-48.
- Kinsui, S. and Takubo, Y. (1998) Danwa kanri riron ni motozuku 'yo' 'ne' 'yone' no kenkyu. In S. Doshita, R. Mizoguchi, K. Niimi, K. Shirai, and H. Tanaka (eds) *Onsei ni yoru Ningen to Kikai no Taiwa*. Tokyo: Ohmsha. pp.257-271.

- Kopytko, R. (1995) Against rationalistic pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics* 23(5): 475-492.
- Kopytko, R. (2001) From Cartesian towards non-Cartesian pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33(6): 783-804.
- Kopytko, R. (2004) The affective context in non-Cartesian pragmatics: A theoretical grounding. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36(3): 521-548.
- Koutlaki, S. A. (2002) Offers and expressions of thanks as face enhancing acts: *Tæ'arof* in Persian. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34(12): 1733-1756.
- Kumatoridani, T. (1999) Alternation and co-occurrence in Japanese thanks. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31(5): 623-642.
- Laforest, M. (2002) Scenes of family life: Complaining in everyday conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34(10-11): 1595-1620.
- Langacker, R. W. (1987) *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar* vol.1. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, R. W. (1990) *Concept, Image, and Symbol: The Cognitive Basis of Grammar*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lee, K. (2002) Nominative case-marker deletion in spoken Japanese: An analysis from the perspective of information structure. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34(6): 683-710.
- Leech, G. N. (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

- Lerner, G. H. and Takagi, T. (1999) On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in-interaction: A co-investigation of English and Japanese grammatical practices. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31(1): 49-76.
- Levinson, S. C. (1979) Activity types and language. *Linguistics* 17: 365-399.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Makino, S. and Tsutsui, M. (1986) *A Dictionary of Basic Japanese Grammar*. Tokyo: Japan Times.
- Masuoka, T. (1991) *Modariti no Bunpo*. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.
- Matsui, T. (2002) Semantics and pragmatics of a Japanese discourse marker *dakara* (so/in other words): A unitary account. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34(7): 867-891.
- Maynard, S. K. (1993) *Discourse Modality: Subjectivity, Emotion, and Voice in the Japanese Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mey, J. L. (2001) *Pragmatics: An Introduction* (2nd edn.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Mori, J. (1999) *Negotiating Agreement and Disagreement in Japanese: Connective Expressions and Turn Construction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nishimura, M. (1995) A functional analysis of Japanese/English code-switching. *Journal of Pragmatics* 23(2): 157-181.
- Nishizaka, A. (1995) The interactive constitution of interculturality: How to be a Japanese with words. *Human Studies* 18(2-3): 301- 326.

- Nishizaka, A. (1999) Doing interpreting within interaction: the interactive accomplishment of a 'henna gaijin' or 'strange foreigner'. *Human Studies* 22(2): 235-252.
- Noda, H. (1997) *'No (da)' no Kino*. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.
- Oso, M. (1986) Goyo bunseki - 'Kyo wa ii tenki desu ne.' 'Hai, so desu ne.' *Nihongogaku* 5(9): 91-94.
- Piazza, R. (2002) The pragmatics of conducive questions in academic discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34(5): 509-527.
- Ravid, D., Olshtain, E. and Ze'elon, E. (2003) 'Gradeschoolers' linguistic and pragmatic speech adaptation to native and non-native interlocution. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35(1): 71-99.
- Rubin, E (1915) Figure and ground. In D. C. Beardslee and M. Wertheimer (eds) *Readings in Perception* (1958). New York: Van Nostrand. pp.194-203.
- Saji, K. (1991) *Nihongo no Bunpo no Kenkyu*. Tokyo: Hituzi Shobo.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994) *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Scollon, R. and Scollon, S. W. (2001) *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach* (2nd edn.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Searle, J. R. (1969) *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Searle, J. R. (1979) *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shibatani, M. (1990) *The Languages of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Silverman, D. (1993) *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Talk, Text, and Interaction*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Silverman, D. (2000) *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (2001) *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Stake, R. (1994) Case studies. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage. pp.236-247.
- Suzuki, R. (1999) Language socialization through morphology: The affective suffix *-chau* in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31(11): 1423-1441.
- Suzuki, S. (1998) *Tte* and *nante*: Markers of psychological distance in Japanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 29(4): 429-462.
- Takubo, Y. and Kinsui, S. (1997) Discourse management in terms of mental spaces. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28(6): 741-758.
- Talmy, L. (1978) Figure and ground in complex sentences. In J. H. Greenberg (ed.) *Universals of Human Language* vol.4. Stanford: Stanford University Press. pp.625-649.

- Talmy, L. (1988) The relation of grammar and cognition. In B. Rudzka-Ostyn (ed.) *Topics in Cognitive Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp.165-205.
- Tanaka, H. (2000) The particle *ne* as a turn-management device in Japanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32(8): 1135-1176.
- Tanomura, T. (1990) *Gendai Nihongo no Bunpo* vol.1. Tokyo: Izumi Shoin.
- Thomas, J. (1983) Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics* 4(2): 91-112.
- Thomas, J. (1995) *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman
- Uyeno, T. (1982) Nihongo eigo. In H. Teramura (ed.) *Koza Nihongogaku* vol.11. Tokyo: Meijishoin. pp.122-141.
- Uyeno, T. Y. (1971) *A Study of Japanese Modality: A Performative Analysis of Sentence-particles*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Wallace, S. (1982) Figure and ground. In P. J. Hopper (ed.) *Tense Aspect: Between Semantics and Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin. pp.201-223.
- Wesche, M. B. and Ready, D. (1985) Foreigner talk in the university classroom. In S. M. Gass and C. G. Madden (eds) *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. Boston, Mass.: Heinle & Heinle. pp.89-114.
- Wilson, D. and Sperber, D. (1993) Linguistic form and relevance. *Lingua* 90(1-2): 1-25.

Wray, A., Trott, K. and Bloomer, A. (1998) *Projects in Linguistics: A Practical Guide to Researching Language*. London: Arnold.

Yoshimi, D. R. (1997) An expanded concept of speakerhood in Japanese discourse. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 6: 583-605.

Yoshimi, D. R. (1999) L1 language socialization as a variable in the use of *ne* by L2 learners of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31(11): 1513-1525.

### **TJFL materials referred in the text**

Association for Japanese-Language Teaching (1994) *Japanese For Busy People I*. Tokyo: Kodansha International.

Jorden, E. H. and Noda, M. (1984) *Japanese: The Spoken Language Part 1*. Tokyo: Kodansha International.

Mizutani, O. and Mizutani, N. (1977) *An Introduction to Modern Japanese*. Tokyo: The Japan Times.

The Association for Overseas Technical Scholarship (1992) *Shin Nihongo no Kiso I: Grammatical Notes in English*. Tokyo: 3A Corporation.

Tohsaku, Y. (1994) *Yookoso!: An Introduction to Contemporary Japanese*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Tsukuba Language Group (1995) *Situational Functional Japanese Vol.1: Notes* (2nd edn.). Tokyo: Bonjinsha.

